

THE MINORITY OF ONE

Independent Monthly Publication, Dedicated to the Elimination of All Thought Restrictions Except for the Truth

"There was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth even against the whole world, you were not mad."—GEORGE ORWELL

Vol. III, No. 6 (19)

Copyright, 1961
THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.



Address for subscriptions and correspondence:
P.O. Box 544, Passaic, N. J.

Editor:
M. S. Arnoni

June, 1961

Can Diplomacy Obtain Surrender?

The Kennedy Offensive

THE MINORITY OF ONE
IN THIS ISSUE:

June, 1961

ANOTHER
"PEACE
CORPS"?

THE
BONDAGE
OF A
LIVELIHOOD

"When Blood is their Argument"
Reflections on the Loss of Gold

Militarism: University Style
The "Final Solution"
An Author's Dilemma

The Iconoclastic Effect of
the John Birch Society
The Los Angeles Lie Factory

and other articles
and features

Mr. Kennedy's concept of the Presidency is a direct response to that of his predecessor. Whatever ostentatious respect Mr. Kennedy may be paying former President Eisenhower in public, deep in his heart he cannot entertain much reverence for a man who, never truly appreciating his historic responsibility, conceived of his high post as a "good time" provided by the nation for his past military exploits. In response to this, Mr. Kennedy is emerging as a President of action, daring and fortitude.

And because of his evident abilities, intelligence and fortitude, combined with fundamental policies no different from those of his predecessors, Mr. Kennedy may yet emerge as the most dangerous and reckless of America's post-World War II Presidents.

Many wishful thinkers had pinned their hopes for a more peaceful world on this charming young man who has himself experienced the horrors of war. Unfortunately, they have been blinded by the personableness of the new President, and however desperate might have been their psychological need to convert their long apprehensions into trust and hope, there is no longer any excuse for missing the obvious and added aggressiveness the President is injecting into American foreign policies. More and more it is becoming evident that President Kennedy is set quite literally on either capturing the world or destroying it.

Theoretically, he has added little to the doctrines embraced by his predecessors. Only, what Messrs. Eisenhower and Dulles often voiced as their propaganda slogans, Mr. Kennedy seems determined to pursue literally. The notorious "Doctrine of Containment" against Soviet influence is for the first time being interpreted with utmost orthodoxy and immediacy. Mr. Kennedy's proposition is that the Communists must consent not only to being contained within their "natural" sphere, but also to letting it shrink and accepting an ever more defensive position. This seems to be Mr. Kennedy's price for peace, and he is determined not to lose sight of this overall objective no matter what particular factors may be involved in one international crisis or another.

regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril."

While this "principle" constitutes nothing new in America's foreign policies, it has never been put so bluntly and officially. Its genesis dates back to the U-2 affair, when then President Eisenhower officially attempted to justify the breach of international law by considerations of national expediency.

In our article "The Reversal to Candor" (TMO, August, 1960) we ventured to predict that *"it would be all too naive and optimistic to expect underlying intentions to change as our diplomats discover the increasing difficulties in maintaining an idealistic front. When our lamblike disguise no longer fools anyone, we will not turn into true lambs. We will simply let the legend evaporate, stripping our diplomacy of its euphemisms and admitting more freely our actual reasons and intentions. No longer will we say: 'We oppose the Communists because they are wrong and unjust' but rather: 'We oppose the Communists because they are our competitors.'* No longer will we claim that our foreign bases 'defend democracy' (especially that of Generalissimo Franco), but instead that they ensure victory (Continued on page 5)

During his important address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 20, 1961 Mr. Kennedy, in essence as well as in actual words, put the world on notice that his Administration will defend whatever it construes as America's interests, irrelevant of any moral or political merits or legal restrictions of international law. He has in effect declared that America will no longer act on principle but merely establish her international power predominance. In this she will not let international public opinion or international legal instruments restrict her course. Mr. Kennedy bluntly stated his sole aim to be that of "winning," "re-

Cloak and Dagger

Another "Peace Corps"

General Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff, was appointed by President Kennedy "to conduct a survey and review of organization and capacity of the United States in para-military planning." The President's Press Secretary Pierre Salinger confirmed that the study will include, but not be confined to, intelligence activities and specifically the Central Intelligence Agency.

The use of the term "para-military" indicates that the study will concern itself with activities of an even more military nature than espionage. In fact, the C.I.A. has not been strictly an intelligence-gathering organization; but also a policy-enforcing arm of the American Government abroad.

General Taylor's mission is at least partly due to the C.I.A.'s spectacular success in deposing a despised Guatemalan government but also, ironically enough, to its spectacular failure to depose the Castro Government. The former occasion must have impressed on the President how much can be "achieved" by the Government's resort to foreign underground operations, while the latter may have shown a "need" to perfect the efficacy of the foreign underground branch.

For decades we have been told about the existence of a cloak and dagger subversive communist organization that, working underground, stretches the Soviet arm throughout the world and maintains an invisible but dangerous web over it. Now, the President of the United States seems set on using our traditional depictions of communist subversion as a blueprint of our own operations. It is fair to speculate that the nature of the activities Mr. Kennedy intends to assign to America's "para-military" agencies is that which he attributes, rightly or wrongly, to communist forces. "Power is the hallmark of this offensive—power and discipline and deceit," the President told the nation's editors. And then he added that "We intend to re-examine and reorient our forces of all kinds, our tactics and our institutions here in this community." The link between these words, uttered on April 20, 1961 and the subsequent assignment of General Taylor, on April 22, is obvious.

The President seems to believe in championing synthetic revolutions. Libertarian movements have been launching revolutions? — Why

couldn't the U.S.A. do the same in reverse? By accepting revolutionary slogans, methods of operation and organization, we can capture the Great Revolution of the Twentieth Century.

The fallacy of this government by imitation is tragic and comic at the same time. There are all kinds of people who use guns in the dark of night, yet not all are social revolutionaries and visionaries. Some are plain bandits. Others, like many of the anti-Castro leaders, are people willing to shed a nation's blood to retain or regain immoral and anti-social material benefits. It is not the gun or dagger that makes one a revolutionary but the social reality he is striving to bring about. The synthetic revolutions and the synthetic conspiratorial forces the President wishes to breed will not only bring about a further devaluation of American political morals, but also contribute to intensifying worldwide fear of America and Americans. Mr. Kennedy may call this "prestige," but in truth it is always the forces one is scared of that he rebels against.

THE MINORITY OF ONE INDEPENDENT MONTHLY PUBLICATION

published by:
THE MINORITY OF ONE, Inc.
77 Pennington Ave.,
P. O. Box 544
Passaic, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

	1 yr.	2 yrs.
United States	\$5.00	\$9.00
Canada	\$5.25	\$9.50
Other foreign subscription rates	submitted on request.	

Material published herein may be reproduced upon written permission from THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC., provided proper credit is given. Unsigned contributions are written by M. S. Arnoni.

NO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING ACCEPTED

Second-class postage paid at
Passaic, N. J.

To Set the Record Straight

By Ernest B. Zeisler

The Salk vaccine fat is in the fire. Newspapers throughout the country are for the first time raising serious questions as to the value of the vaccine. The CHICAGO SUNDAY TRIBUNE carried a three-page review of the article of last August in the ILLINOIS MEDICAL JOURNAL exposing the disreputable campaign of deception waged for nearly six years by the U.S. Public Health Service, the National Foundation and the medical journals and societies. The worst feature of the entire outrage was the conspiracy of silence that the medical journals were guilty of, so that they refused to print even the fact that there was contrary opinion. The JOURNAL OF THE AMA was, as usual, on the wrong side.

One of the unfortunate results of the Salk vaccine deception will be that the public at large will blame the physicians at large. In fact, *most physicians were entirely honest* in urging the use of the Salk vaccine, for they had been deceived in the same way the public had been. Individual physicians have no way of judging the efficacy of the vaccine from their own experience, which is far too limited to warrant conclusions. They must depend on the experience of all other physicians, that is, they must depend on the statistics furnished them by the U.S. Public Health Service and the medical journals. Further, since very few physicians have the technical training in statistics to enable them to draw valid inferences from the data, they must depend for their opinions on the conclusions promulgated by so-called authorities. And if, as in the present instance, these authorities are in a conspiracy to deceive them, and to clamp a tight lid on all contrary opinion, physicians as well as public will be fooled, as they have been.

It may be worth recalling that in 1941 the American Medical Association and the District of Columbia Medical Society were found guilty of a criminal conspiracy to violate the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. During the trial, Dr. William Dick Cutter, Secretary of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the AMA since 1931, committed perjury on March 11; during cross-examination he admitted that his previous testimony on various points had been false. The transcript of the trial can be found in the JOURNAL OF THE AMA, Vol. 116, page 1434, 1941; Cutter's admission is on page 1436, column 2. In spite of this, Dr. Cutter retained his position until his death the following year.

The dishonesty of our press in opposing all peaceful moves is seconded by the juvenile mouthings of some military, such as General Twining, who declares that all peacemaking is "national cringing." It is too bad, *en passant*, that Twining did not himself cringe from accepting payola when he was the Chief of Staff.

Four hundred years ago, in his *Essay 10 of Book III*, Montaigne said: "Let him who cannot appeal to reason appeal to the passions" (Cicero). Those who extend their anger and hatred beyond the view in question, as most people do, show that it is due to some other, some personal reason; . . . The fact is that they have no feeling against the cause in general, and in so far as it injures the interest of all and of the State. But they hate it only in so far as it galls them in their private interest. That is why they are stung to a particular passion, to a degree beyond justice and common sense." This fits the members of the John Birch Society very well. They say they wish to fight Communism in the name of Democracy. But totalitarian means and stifling of all dissent are the very things they favor and resort to. These Birchers have the effrontery to say they honor Robert Taft, in the same breath in which they honor Joseph McCarthy; Taft despised McCarthy, and would despise Welch and all he stands for.

Dr. Zeisler is Clinical Associate Professor of Medicine at the Chicago Medical School, the author of several volumes and a permanent TMO contributor. His study, "The Great Salk Vaccine Fiasco," appeared in the June, 1960 issue of TMO.

The Bondage of a Livelihood

A Charleston, S. C. millionaire, the proprietor of a prosperous chain of department stores, once said to me: "I should be willing to kiss the . . . of every woman that comes into one of my stores, if it'd make her spend an additional dime." The man's figurative expression did not minimize the sincerity of his attitude. And, in the next breath, he undertook to instruct me on the blessings and virtues of living in a "free society," testifying to the truism that all too often the slave is least of all aware of his slavery.

Yet, the difference between that man and many who would react to his words with indignation is primarily a matter of admitting the true nature of one's behavior pattern. His originality lay in admitting something others would not only deny but vehemently try to rationalize out of existence. He was honest about his dishonesty, fully admitting the hypocrisy of his behavior, even though in his perverted sense of values hypocrisy became virtue and life mastery.

If a financially "independent" individual was aware of the restrictions upon his behavior and attitudes stemming from his economic interests, one can easily imagine the financial bondage that restrains people who are not quite as affluent.

The total capriciousness of the hiring and firing acts in America is a highly important feature of the American System. In this respect the United States cannot be counted among the civilized countries of the world. Virtually all other capitalistic countries have adopted legislation that establishes mutual responsibility of the parties involved in an employer-employee relationship. The theory behind such legislation is that while the employer owns the means of production, he does not unequivocally own the employment opportunities involved in his endeavor. In a society in which the entrepreneur depends on raw materials supplied by others, on innumerable services performed by people he does not hold a direct relationship with, on the acceptance of his product or service by a large number of people at large, employment opportunity cannot be presented as one created by the entrepreneur alone. It results from an interplay of many direct and indirect, tangible and elusive social factors that involve an indefinite number of individuals. Under the circumstances, to conceive of the employment opportunity as a purely discretionary and arbitrary prerogative of the hirer alone would accommodate a usurpation of authority that eliminates the political influence of most people and factors that cause and are involved in the production of an employment opportunity. Yet, in the United States, the hiring and firing acts are recognized as the arbitrary domain of the immediate employer, unrestricted by laws and open to no more than the post-factum challenges of trade unions.

It is this anarchy that causes the wage earner's overwhelming fear of losing his livelihood. If he is employed not by virtue of his right but by virtue of someone's capriciousness that for the moment favors him, and if he can lose his employment for reasons not only beyond his control but quite unrelated to his work-and-man relationship, and if obtaining alternative employment also depends on the capriciousness of other

people, then indeed his livelihood decisively depends on the correctness of his conjectures as to how he will best please the arbitrary administrators of that livelihood.

This psychological pressure is so universal that the compromise of ethical and intellectual principles to hold a job meets general public acceptance and appreciation. It is something expected of the individual and if he does not permit it to be all-decisive in his life, he is considered as lacking in personal, family and social responsibility.

The dilemma this creates is real. It is not easy for a man to assert his true intellectual, ethical and social personality when it runs contrary to the expediencies of making a living. The clash is between two responsibilities. When one's livelihood depends on his being a hypocrite, there is no easy solution to his predicament; of necessity, the choice lies between two reprehensible alternatives. One can neither shed off his financial responsibility for himself and his family, nor gladly turn into a socio-political reptile.

Yet, a choice must often be made. Resigned to the proposition that within the prevailing social relationships no ideal solution is possible, the individual must choose whichever way is least damaging to himself, his family and society in general. While the notorious conformist might celebrate the preceding sentence as a vindication of what he believes he has been doing all along, to us it is by no means indisputable that the worst that can happen to an individual and his family is the loss of an income. Not that we propose to condone a degree of personal irresponsibility that pays no due attention to man's financial obligations towards himself and his family; but an unbiased confrontation of the possible repercussions will suggest that, as against the permanent damage incurred from hypocritical conformism, that resulting from the loss of a livelihood is usually transient.

Equally important is the fact that when the individual allows his concern for a livelihood to become the sole and overriding criterion of his behavior, his hypocritical conformism usually goes far beyond the demands of job security. In his exaggerated fear of losing his employment, he is prone to conceive of the conformism expected of him as far more demanding, all-embracing and uncompromising than it actually is. His escape from his inner personality is more total than was needed in order for him to retain his livelihood. Once he learns to sacrifice his analytical abilities and expressive capacities to conjectures about social tastes and acceptability, he has lost a mental property that cannot be saved, however slightly compromised. The transmutation was basic and fundamental. He lost that inherent capacity for inquiry that distinguishes

the human being. Now, all his inquiry into himself, into his own thinking and feeling, is detoured into the social labyrinths over which he has no control. Conjecture takes over his inner world of thought, falseness and pretense replace any genuine qualities of conception and perception, and his mind degenerates to the point of accepting things as the opposite of what they are.

His counterpart, the man who chooses to retain his true personality even at the price of jeopardizing his livelihood, will be a much less damaged individual. True, he may momentarily encounter difficult problems of supporting himself and his family. His financial predicament is least of all a pleasant one or one that should not worry him. He will, however, experience satisfactions he did not anticipate. The external difficulties will be accompanied by the humanizing and purifying feeling of retaining one's freedom. No matter how many external difficulties he may encounter, he will experience the satisfaction man derives from acting justly and genuinely. He will possess true inner freedom; instead of being miserable, as the conformist would suspect him to be, he will display quite a degree of strength and immunity to the blows of the outside world. Freedom is not a state one can bargain for or obtain from others. Freedom one can obtain only from himself. When he wins it, he knows it and carries it with pride and satisfaction, ready to retain it at any cost. Inner freedom knows not external conditions. You can have it while poverty stricken, you can retain it between the walls of a jail without ever devaluating your personality with sterile self-pity.

Under the prevailing conditions in the United States man can hardly be himself unless he learns to compromise his responsibility for making a living. Unless losing his livelihood becomes a tolerable thought, he cannot retain his inner freedom.

Here and there one hears of a man who voluntarily gave up his participation in the materialistic rat race to dedicate himself to a more wholesome endeavor that enables him to keep soul and body together. Such people are not necessarily "idealists." They do not settle for less living; on the contrary, they are out to indulge in it more fully, wholesomely and rewardingly. They may well have compromised their incomes, but a newly gained life perspective enables them to experience happiness and satisfactions they previously did not even know existed. Their feeling is not that of a newly experienced poverty but of a newly discovered richness.

It is not a coincidence that economic boycott is one of the chief means of enforcing conformism in the United States. Such boycotts are applied in many quite effective ways. From an employment opportunity that is conditioned by the employee's readiness to comply with prevailing social and political standards all the way to the open application of boycott against business enterprises as a political means, the spectrum ranges in a system in which tolerance of dissension is literary rather than literal.

THE BRIGHTER SIDE

Three Cheers

► FOR THE U.S. SUPREME COURT for rejecting appeals by natural gas producers from lower court decisions ordering the Federal Power Commission to review two rate cases, and thereby admonishing the FPC for not protecting consumer interests.

► FOR HENRY FORD II for speaking out against the lack of ethics in business as especially revealed in the criminal conspiracies of the electrical machinery producers.

► FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY for issuing an order that no executive agency of the Government permit its name to be used in connection with any employee recreational group practicing racial discrimination.

► FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY for:

—warning that his department would not tolerate mob action against the desegregation of public schools;
—initiating court action intended to bring about the re-opening of public schools in Prince Edward County, Va., closed down since 1959 to prevent their desegregation.

► FOR WILLIAM F. SCHARNIKOW, an examiner of the National Labor Relations Board, for ruling that Bilton, Inc. of Arlington, Va. engaged in unfair labor practices in refusing to rehire two employees involved in union activities.

► FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT McNAMARA for warning his personnel against accepting gifts and hospitality from citizens and firms they deal with in the performance of their official duties.

► FOR SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG for engaging two recruiters of federal employees to encourage Negro college graduates to enter the ranks of the Civil Service.

► FOR THE RESIDENTS OF WASHINGTON, D.C. who, with one single exception, failed to respond to official encouragements that would have them counter-demonstrate in front of the Soviet Embassy in support of American interventionism in Cuba.

► FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATE OF SIERRE LEONE.

wrath of God as the enforcement agency.

Even in this respect the distinction was not very sharp throughout history. In antiquity the rulers were usually deified. Later, Europe came in contact with two great religions: Christianity and Islam. Their leaders, the Popes and the Caliphs, were sovereigns of immense domains with a merger of spiritual and temporal authority.

Realizing the tremendous potential of psychological weapons, the governments of the world were quick to enter the gigantic battle for the minds of men.

All successful modern dictators from Stalin to Hitler employed the same basic psychological pattern. They have found a scapegoat and identified it as the ultimate enemy. To have a scapegoat creates an emotional relief in the populace, just as individuals take refuge in rationalization and blame others for their misfortunes. Artificially excited mass-meetings pregnant with emotion are not uncommon in our century.

That people are easily incited into aggressive action is understandable and natural. Whether we consider ourselves fallen angels or emancipated apes, the fact remains that for untold millions of years our ancestors have known only the law of the jungle. It is possible to divert this destructive instinct that is so much a part of us into sports, hunting, games or other competitive activity. Our six-thousand-year-old veneer of civilization, however, can easily be scratched by irresponsible politicians.

In fact, all our values are relative. As the needs of society change, the values change. Killing is permitted, even required, in war. Family planning was adjudged differently when the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse (famine, war, pestilence, and death) were riding high than now when the monster of overpopulation threatens the world.

How will the thoughts of men be controlled in the future? Will biocontrol one day make psychological methods seem old-fashioned?

Biocontrol is the new science of controlling mental processes, emotional reactions, and sense perceptions by bioelectric signals. Laboratory tests have indicated that painless electric stimulation of certain areas of the brain can make one meek, belligerent, amorous, or hungry.

At the 1956 National Electronics Conference in Chicago, C. R. Schafer, electrical engineer with the Norden-Ketay Corporation expounded the prospects of biocontrol. He was quoted in TIME magazine: "The ultimate achievement of biocontrol may be the control of man himself. . . . The controlled subjects would never be permitted to think as individuals. A few months after birth, a surgeon would equip each child with . . . electrodes reaching selected areas of brain tissue. . . . The child's sensory perception and muscular activity could be . . . completely controlled by bio-electric signals radiating from state-controlled transmitters." He added the cheerful thought that the electrodes cause no discomfort.

At present, however, biocontrol still belongs in the realm of science fiction, and the experts on group dynamics will have to content themselves with the old but well-proven methods of psychological thought-control.

Biocontrol of Men

By Edmond P. Odescalchi

Every time an election approaches, professional image builders apply the latest discoveries of depth psychology to manipulate human behavior. The experts on group dynamics and social physics switch from selling breakfast cereal to promoting political candidates.

The merchandising approach to politics involves every means of mass persuasion from Freud's father image to Pavlov's conditioned responses. Lighting and make-up for TV cameras, and measuring the effect of slogans are important aspects of political campaigns.

Party machineries use the proven method of commercial advertising: constant repetition. This ceaseless barrage of slogans was explained by advertising executive Rosser Reeves: "I think of a man in a voting booth who hesitates between two levers as if he were pausing between competing tubes of tooth paste in a drugstore. The brand that has made the highest penetration on his brain will win his choice."

Since in a free society the opposition can also beat its drums, the admen's resources

are better taxed here than in a controlled society. The public persuaders in Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda had a much easier job manufacturing political trends.

Tremendous amounts of money are spent each day by governments and other organizations to influence the opinions of their fellow men. What happens in the human mind between input (stimulus) and output (action)?

To evaluate the behavior of an individual, we have to know his past experiences which—obeying the law of cause and effect—determine his response to a certain stimulus. To overcome this hurdle of psychodynamics, a given population must be shaped to conformity through the ancient but effective tool of propaganda.

In tracing the origin of propaganda one is apt to draw an analogy between politics and religion. Both have ultimately the same goal: to make people behave in a certain way, according to established rules and principles without which organized existence would not be possible. The difference between state and church lies in law enforcement. For every law is worthless unless it can be enforced. The state uses the policeman, while the church relies on the

Dr. Odescalchi is a psychologist and the author of a number of scientific articles, mostly on cybernetics.
* Vance Packard, *Hidden Persuaders*, David McKay Co., 1957.

"When Blood is Their Argument"

By Robert Anton Wilson

My favorite bit of prose of 1961 was TIME magazine's account of the Cuban debate in the UN. TIME characterized the Cuban ambassador, Raul Roa as "liverish," "little" and "shrill"—i.e., the kind of character who would make a great foil for Abbott and Costello. The Russian ambassador, more simply, is "no great brain," according to TIME. Against these burlesque figures stands that model of statesmanship and wisdom, Adlai Stevenson, the Uncrowned King of Liberalism, "speaking with unusual intensity" (but not, of course, intense enough to become "shrill") and laboring "to explain to the world what is already self-evident: that the U.S. considered Cuba a clear threat to hemisphere security."

Comparing the size, manpower, industrialization, armaments, etc. of the U.S. and Cuba, one might feel that Stevenson would do better trying to persuade the world that a tiger that ate a rabbit considered the rabbit a threat to security. But that let pass. The really fascinating thing about TIME's report is that they have to repeat Stevenson's actual denial of the chief fact at issue.

The facts presented by TIME indicate clearly that Stevenson was lying and the Russian and Cuban ambassadors were not; the emotional tone of TIME's report buries these facts so effectively that the implication emerges that a man of dignity and principle was unfairly attacked by two

clownish hooligans. To put it mildly (and in TIMEstyle) this is being fast and Luce with the truth.

One of the most significant remarks made about the whole subject of the Cuban invasion is missing from TIME's account, but appears in TIME's less literate sister, LIFE. This was the remark made by President Kennedy—good old idealistic John F. Kennedy—when approving the invasion. The President said that U.S. troops must not be used, because "I don't want a Hungary in Cuba."

It seems that what Kennedy meant by "a Hungary" is not the moral quality of that episode of history, but the repercussions of it. He is using the standard which all Proper Bostonians use about sex: it doesn't matter what you do, but it does matter what you get caught at. This is exactly the standard that all fascist governments use in international affairs. My good Liberal friends who voted for Mr. Kennedy and considered me a beatnik for refusing to vote can decide for themselves what share of guilt they must bear for helping this man to achieve power.

Readers who save old copies of the MINORITY can check this for themselves: I have never uttered a word of praise for Fidel Castro. The undeniable good that Castro has done for Cuba, in land reform, building schools and so forth, doesn't, to my peculiarly old-fashioned 19th-Century-

Liberal mind, wipe the blood of vindictive and tyrannical executions off his hands. But, in the same bull-headed and old-fashioned way, I will repeat until they take my typewriter away and shove me in jail: whatever food Kennedy distributes to the needy in West Virginia, whatever liberal social reforms he makes inside this nation, will not free him of the crimson taint of brutal imperialism. The "crackpot realism" that flourishes in all political persuasions, Left and Right, in these sad psychotic times, will regard me as impractical and "immature." But that kind of "maturity" and "realism," having destroyed 22,000,000 people the last time it went into action on a large scale, keeps us living in a world that's as jittery as an armed madhouse. After such realism, it is time that the idealists had a chance. As Shakespeare asked of the military mind three centuries ago: "But if the cause be not good, the king himself hath a heavy reckoning to make, when all those legs and arms and heads, chopped off in battle, shall join together at the latter day and cry all 'We died at such a place'; some swearing, some crying for a surgeon, some upon their wives left poor behind them, some upon the debts they owe, some upon their children rawly left. I am afraid there are few die well that die in a battle; for how can they charitably dispose of any thing, when blood is their argument?"

The Kennedy Offensive (Continued from page 1)

to be...
in war, no matter who starts it. There
will be a cynical reversal to honesty of pre-
sentation that is not identical with honesty
of goal or motivation."

The predicted trend has found final and official confirmation in President Kennedy's April 20th address.

His strong-arm announcement did not precede but followed his strong-arm policies. American policies both in Laos and Cuba have been pursued with little effort to camouflage their aggressiveness and with disregard for anything but expediency. Neither our press nor our official spokesmen have had any qualms about admitting that news about alleged Soviet arming of the Pathet Lao forces, news that was used as a pretext for our own admitted military supplying and guidance of the Laotian power usurpers, was intentionally fabricated.

When the American-sponsored putsch against the neutralist government in Laos started suffering decisive military setbacks and was about to be abrogated, we pressured the Soviets to pressure the Pathet Lao in turn for a cease fire. In the face of military defeat, we started pretending that we were interested in the very opposite objective from that for which we had sponsored the putsch: Laotian neutrality. But even in the midst of pressuring for a cease fire that

would salvage our last Laotian subversives, there were indications that we did not truly intend to abide by Laotian neutrality. The snubbing, by both President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk, of Prince Souvanna Phouma during his projected and then canceled visit to Washington indicates the hypocritical nature of our tactical endorsement of Laotian neutrality. Conceivably, this was the carrot to induce the Pathet Lao into agreeing to a cease fire, while we waited for a better opportunity to pocket Laos into the SEATO scheme. The pattern was familiar. Previously, a temporary inclusion of the Pathet Lao in a coalition government ultimately emerged as nothing but an anesthetic for their physical decimation.

We are concerned in Laos not with the country's becoming a Soviet satellite but with its refusal to become a SEATO satellite. In 1954, during the Geneva conference, international instruments were signed that faithfully reflected the Atlantic block's physical inability to make Laos an integral part of itself. But paying no attention to decisive local sentiment, we kept poking the body of Laos in the never relinquished hope of tearing the Geneva Convention to shreds. The Kennedy Administration may still be determined to achieve this. Any international agreement it might enter into that would seem to recognize Laotian non-alliance may

eventually emerge as a transient tactical expedient; the true intention may well remain—to swallow the reluctant country no matter what. Such an underlying intention would guarantee that Laos will not experience peace for a long time. The provocations might spread into adjoining territories, as they are already growing in Viet-Nam, and there is no telling what proportions they might ultimately assume.

With regard to the abortive invasion of Cuba neither our press nor official spokesmen have had any qualms about admitting our decisive political and military role. Only on the most formal level of the United Nations did Ambassador Adlai Stevenson cling to the compromised and elsewhere abandoned pretense of innocence. There is a sad and ironic twist in the fact that while the Kennedy Administration departs on an ever more candid course of provocations and admitted power politics, it has remained for Adlai Stevenson to man its last bastion of diplomatic pretense and camouflage.

But more typical was a Florida dispatch to THE NEW YORK TIMES by correspondent Tad Szulc on April 7, 1961. It disclosed, with an amazing lack of inhibition, details about the counter-revolutionary training centers in Florida, Louisiana and Guatemala. It put the number of trainees at 5,000-6,000, specified the various stages of training as well as the arms available from airplanes to naval units, and disclosed the

(Continued on page 16)

Reflections on the Loss of Gold

By Paul Mattick

"Gold is a wonderful thing," wrote Columbus; "whoever possesses it is master of all that he desires. By means of gold even admission to heaven may be gained for souls." Others were not so sure. In his *UTOPIA*, Thomas More envisioned an end of the corrupting worship of gold and its degradation to that of a mere material for manufacturing household utensils. But utopia was far away and Columbus's attitude prevailed. A few centuries later, however, utopia seemed a real possibility. With the success of world revolution, Lenin wrote, gold would be used in the construction of public lavatories. And this would not only be just but also instructive, for it would remind coming generations of the millions of people killed for the sake of gold. Until then, however, Lenin thought it best "to howl with the wolves" and to keep on producing gold for trade with the capitalist enemy.

The decreasing popularity of gold, however, reflects changes in the market economy from laissez-faire to manipulation and state intervention. This was a long process which began with the creation of the modern banking and credit system and the displacement of commodity-money (gold) by paper currencies. But as the idea of a self-regulatory market mechanism demands that money be a commodity, it has to be covered at least in part by gold. The laissez-faire system found its international extension in the "automatism" of the gold standard which linked every nation's money and price levels with those of all other nations and made domestic prosperity, as Keynes later complained, directly dependent on the competitive pursuit of markets and gold. But some nations were more successful than others and, at times, no nation could afford to wait for "automatic" solutions of crisis conditions. Governments resorted to political, i.e. extra-market, measures which interfered with the "self-regulatory" market mechanism and ended the international gold standard.

Freed from preoccupations with the international economy, governments could now manipulate the national money supply by way of credit inflation and currency devaluation. To make such interventions generally effective, gold was withdrawn from circulation and its possession by private persons became a crime. But since it is not gold but capital in the form of real property and productive facilities which constitutes the great bulk of the national wealth, it was not difficult to bring the gold under government control. While commodity-money circulated because it had value, paper money has value because it circulates. Not exchangeable for gold, it is actually based on nothing but confidence that it will retain its value or, rather, on confidence in the government's monetary policies.

Internationally, however, the elimination of commodity-money (gold) is not yet possible. In principle, of course, there is no

need for the gold-exchange mechanism; compensatory cancellations of credits and debts could be achieved without international gold transfers. It is lack of confidence in the world market's "equilibrium mechanism" or, perhaps, a realistic attitude toward it, which explains the insistence upon international settlements in gold. Nonetheless, suggestions multiply—sometimes as a joke and sometimes seriously—about making arrangements for international business transactions without the aid, or the encumbrance, of the gold-exchange mechanism. If this should prove possible, gold reserves would, of course, no longer be necessary. For the gold in the vaults of the bank would belong to all and to nobody; commodity-money would have come to an end. The elimination of the gold-exchange mechanism would no more affect the world economy than the withdrawal of gold in single nations affected these nations economically.

II

Monetary gold has always had its advantages and disadvantages. Its natural properties and comparative indestructibility made it the ideal money-commodity but also a particularly apt store of wealth. The hoarding of monetary gold caused much concern even though it could be countered by artificial means of exchange. But the idea persisted that a scarcity of gold was detrimental to the exchange process, and this carried over into the sphere of international business transactions. World trade, it was said, expanded faster than gold production and a growing need for larger reserves exceeded the available gold supply. Notwithstanding short intervals to the contrary, however, the world's gold reserves have generally increased in concordance with the increase of international trade. And to increase gold reserves to a larger extent than is actually necessary could only add, but not diminish, economic difficulties traceable, as they are, to insufficient business profitability. For while the producers of gold, like other producers, realize profits on their product, for "society as a whole" gold, as money, constitutes a loss. As money, gold does not enter either into production or consumption but is an expense of exchange. To increase it means to increase the costs of circulation.

The point, then, is not to enlarge the store of monetary gold beyond the necessary minimum but to make exchange work more efficiently. To get rid of gold reserves altogether would mean to decrease the expense of circulation to the extent of the value embodied in monetary gold. But this is not going to happen for some time to come. For as long as money retains—and it may even be in the smallest measure—the form of commodity-money, there remains a connection and resemblance between the free market economy of yesterday and the controlled economy of today. Moreover, the use of gold for monetary purposes has a very long history and the custom has ac-

quired staying powers of its own. After all, gold is a metal valued for itself. It has its uses in industry and esthetic consumption. It will thus be desired as a store of wealth quite independently of its money function. And as a useful thing it will be exchangeable for other useful objects even if outlawed as a circulatory medium. In this sense, the holding of gold (in any form) constitutes either a personal or a national asset and, though not really necessary, it may as well continue to play a monetary role.

III

Nations hold their monetary reserves in gold and dollars and to a lesser extent in British pounds. Under the gold-exchange agreement the United States is committed to exchange dollars for gold. There are now as many, or more, dollars in foreign hands as there is gold in terms of dollars in the United States. There exists, then, a "theoretical," though not actual, possibility of a "run" on the United States gold.

Even so, the current concern about the United States payments deficit is understandable as it threatens not only the loss of gold but also disturbances in existing trade relations. After the second World War, for instance, the world outside the United States held about 25.5 billion in gold and dollars. America had a favorable balance of trade of approximately \$10 billion yearly. If, for one reason or another, the rest of the world had been unable to produce for export and had likewise been unable to do without imports from America, the United States would have had all the world's gold and dollars within less than three years and her trade with other nations would have come to an end. To assume this situation is to show its actual impossibility. The process could exist only as a tendency which had to be, and was, arrested and reversed by economic recovery and American aid. The large American export surplus was offset by loans and grants until more reciprocal trade relations were reestablished. Likewise, America's present payments deficit will not lead to the exhaustion of her gold reserves, the less so, as it is still associated with a favorable balance of trade. It is a reversible tendency and merely demonstrates that the favorable balance of trade is not favorable enough to compensate for America's foreign expenditures.

The payments deficit began with the American aid program in 1949. Within the next ten years it grew to about \$22 billion, of which 5 billion were met by gold exports. In 1949, however, America held an excessive 70 per cent of the world's total gold supply. In 1960 her payments deficit was about \$3,250,000,000 and the gold outflow about half of that. But of the world's total gold supply (outside the U.S.S.R.) of about \$40 billion, the United States still held roughly \$18 billion. Though less than it has been at any other time during the last twenty years, it is still higher than the gold

Mr. Mattick is an economist and has contributed to many American and foreign magazines, including *THE NEW REPUBLIC*, *DISSENT* and *PARTISAN REVIEW*.

reserves of any other nation, or bloc of nations such as the Common Market. Moreover, as only a quarter of the world's trade is conducted in dollars, while over half is done in sterling, the loss of American gold and the corresponding increase of the reserves of other nations may simply be seen as an adjustment of the world's gold supply to the post-war recovery which ended the excessive concentration of gold in the United States.

However, it is not the loss of gold, or even the amount thus far involved, which causes apprehension, but the rate of loss and its implications for the near future. To some extent the flow of gold indicates shifts in international market relations. Despite a favorable balance of trade it has become more difficult for America to compete on the world market and correspondingly easier for other nations. The exceptional advance of some nations was partly based on retardation in others. What America lost in gold was gained by Japan and by West European countries. Unless *all* Western nations expand production and trade at a pace faster than that of recent years, ending America's payments deficit by way of greater exports will merely reduce the exports of those allied nations which are much more dependent on international trade than is the United States. It would undo their recent recovery to some degree and most probably end recent relaxations of trade restrictions. This is reason enough to look for a solution of America's payments problem not in the sphere of international competition but in that of the domestic economy.

First reactions to the growing deficit and loss of gold were, of course, the traditional ones: the increase of exports and decrease of imports. But these are mere suggestions the realization of which, if possible at all, requires time. More immediate, but also more limited, actions attempted to diminish the foreign dollar supply by binding American loans to underdeveloped countries to purchases in American markets, to institute dollar-saving procurement policies, to attract foreign tourists and foreign capital, and to prohibit the purchase and holding of gold abroad by American citizens and enterprises. Notice was given to allied nations that now that they have recovered, they must partake in greater measure in the profitless burden of Western "defense."

IV

Quite generally, if a country extends too much credit to other nations, and if it exports substantially more capital than it imports, payment difficulties are bound to arise despite a favorable balance of trade. America's payments deficit may then be considered as an unavoidable outcome of her economic preponderance. It would be greater than it actually is had not various nations repaid large amounts of their debts, often in advance of their maturity. But it has found no relief by way of capital movements. American investments abroad exceed foreign investments in America by more than \$24 billion. The present inflow of income from foreign investments equals the outflow of new American investments

abroad and does not affect the payments balance. The deficit could be reduced by stopping capital exports while increasing incentives for investments, domestic as well as foreign, in American industry and also, of course, by reducing, or ending, dollar transfers for military and economic aid to other nations, which now run between \$5 and \$6 billion annually.

However, these latter expenditures are largely of a political nature. To interfere with capital movements runs counter to the proclaimed desire to eliminate gradually all forms of protectionism. It would reduce the payments deficit but only at the expense of Japan and the West European nations whose economies flourish at least in part because of large capital imports. Compared to the United States, these economies are relatively weak despite their present prosperous conditions and they fail to understand why they should neglect their own interests for America's payments balance. They consider that America's gold reserve is perfectly adequate, and this the more so, as they are not at all sure that their present dollar surplus may not again become a dollar shortage.

Actually, although foreign assets convertible into gold exceed America's gold stock, the latter is substantial enough to provide for more than the legally required 25 per cent currency-backing. It represents an almost hundred per cent gold backing for short-term liabilities. And as it cannot be in the interest of foreigners with short-term dollar assets yielding interest to convert them into gold which does not yield interest, the great bulk of these assets will not be turned into gold. But why, then, the recent accelerated outflow of gold? This has far less to do with the current payments deficit than with the present total state of the American economy.

"The American economy is in trouble," according to President Kennedy, because "the most resourceful industrialized country on earth ranks among the last in the rate of economic growth." But how to end this relative stagnation? As in the past, it may be overcome by inflationary means and a further devaluation of the dollar. There arises then the desire to get rid of currency that loses its value in terms of gold. A devaluation of the dollar may be reflected in a rise of the gold price, now fixed at \$35 an ounce, or in the loss of the dollar's buying-power without a change in the price of gold. In either case, the conversion of dollars into gold side-steps the possible loss of devaluation. In case the price of gold should rise, there is the possibility for speculative gains through the reconversion of gold into dollars.

But quite apart from the dollar's future, depressed American business conditions and the relative prosperity of Western Europe has shifted both investment capital and so-called "hot money" from America to Europe in search for better returns and higher interest rates. Disbelief in a turn for the better and in the dollar's stability was so strong that money was converted into gold rather than returned to the low-interest-rate American market when Germany and Switzerland forbade interest payments on foreign de-

posits. A steadily increasing demand drove the gold price on the London exchange beyond its fixed limit and would have led to an even greater outflow of gold from America had the Bank of England attempted to meet the demand by offering a greater supply to prevent the gold price rising.

The "dramatic" events on the London gold-exchange, though not very important themselves, gave expression to the conviction that the dollar is no longer what the government pretends it is, and to a widespread fear that the American recession will find an inflationary answer. The advice of America's anti-inflationist interests with respect to the gold loss and payments deficit is, then, the pursuit of sound monetary and fiscal policies; a stable dollar and a balanced budget. In his first State of the Union message, the new President pledged himself "not to disturb the value of the dollar in any fashion." But he was "certain that the Federal budget for fiscal 1961 will show a net deficit," and that the 1962 budget "will remain in balance only if the Congress enacts all the revenue measures requested—and only if an earlier and sharper upturn in the economy . . . produces the tax revenues estimated." This is most unlikely, however: particularly in view of the proposed huge program of welfare measures, foreign aid, and new armaments which, if carried through, will require extensive deficit financing and further increase in the national debt. The financing of domestic and foreign government projects will become increasingly more difficult even if the national income grows, and the temptation to solve the difficulties by inflationary means will always be present. However, if the government should be inclined—and be so enabled—to solve domestic problems by increasing interventions in the economy, it will also be able to close the payments deficit by direct interferences in the international economy and to stop the loss of gold by a political act.

Hades and Olympus

The Original Theft

The first thief was not a pickpocket. What he stole could not be concealed nor passed on to a fence; he stole the biggest thing within his vision—he stole the earth. Those who sell you the Brooklyn Bridge or the Eiffel Tower are but unimaginative imitators of the man who, with impunity, stole the entire globe. And once he established his dubious ownership, he erected toll booths over every inch of the globe's surface and innards, charging everyone else a fee for being born and needing a physical locus on "his" property. He claims the right to do that. You and I weren't present on the day God's bequest was opened and read off, willing only to him the globe and all that is in and above it. It seems that he, the grand thief, was the only man legitimately born; the rest of us must pay him a rent tax for usurping his right to birth and earth, for using "his" soil, water, air and minerals. This was the most successful and complete theft ever committed. Or, perhaps, the landowner and rent charger is a god who truly owns the universe?

The truism that nothing ever disappears in nature applies equally in the social realm; man's and society's problems are never resolved with finality. Obvious as this may sound on the surface, man has had great difficulties in adopting this principle as a guide to his social thinking. He has always been on the search for solutions, final solutions, of the challenges of living and the difficulties of co-living with others. Being a political as well as a social creature, he has never resigned himself to live with his problems; he has always sought to abrogate them. Since time immemorial man has been a philosopher and his mind is such that his thinking does not come just to satisfy his curiosity but also to fulfill a social function; he does not merely wish to understand himself and his environment but to apply that understanding to changing them.

Man is not, however, an all too acute observer. Thousands of years of his observing himself and other men have not altered his mental dependence on myths, legends and fantasies which intellectually are hardly above the level of his predecessors millennia ago. We may flatter ourselves with a belief that modern theology is superior to that of idol worshippers, but in actuality monotheism may well be an even narrower oversimplification of life and the universe than was the more diversified theology of paganism.

Yet, in his desperate attempt to perceive life and the universe with a mind that comprehends neither, man has no choice but to resort to oversimplifications. We do not even possess the sensitivity to register all objects around us that are conceivable, not through speculation, but simply by sensual perception. Paraphrasing Zenon, we watch a million different objects that never stop their process of changing and call them all "a river." We talk about ourselves as being "a man," while in the very process of talking the man becomes men. The slowness of our perception, however, causes us to refer to them all as "a man," as if he were static, final, just one.

The discrepancy between our perception and the thing perceived is very large whenever it involves motion. In our minds the speed of several hundred miles per hour is "fantastic," while the speed of celestial bodies is beyond our capacity to visualize. At the most we can refer to it through scientific symbols, but who can close his eyes and imagine the speed of light?

This limitation of perception afflicts us not only with regard to the phenomena of the universe but also with regard to our own short lives. Human perception is much slower than human living itself. This is why we have such great difficulty understanding what is wrong in our lives and how they can be improved.

In the socio-political realm, this limitation is responsible for dogma. Modern man believes himself to be much less dogmatic than his predecessors were; in actuality, when we compare the socio-political trends of our time with those of the Middle Ages, we must appreciate that the development has not been towards less dogma but towards diversified dogmas. Modern man still believes himself to be headed towards the ultimate solution to man's problems. A day

SELF-DEFEAT OF DOGMA

The "Final Solution"

will come when life will be pure enjoyment, free of care, perfectly hospitable. The sole challenge is to bring that day about, and once it comes it will stay forever. Our social utopias may vary, but they all share the promise of finality. Once our present problems are solved, there will be no problems.

The Final Solution is the belief that the fulfillment of man's postulates will nullify the frustrations of living. It conceives of the present as transient, inconsequential and significant only in how it affects the ultimate state; does it bring utopia nearer or does it postpone its fulfillment? It looks upon society as being on its way somewhere, on the road to the main experience of living.

There is an element of masochistic idealism in that faith; it is more tolerant of present than future wrongs; it is less concerned with the sufferings of the present generation than of future generations. It is as if we were bribed to accept our own sufferings, worries and discomforts in return for a promise of better times for our children.

This deception has often been used by oligarchies to forestall rebellions. In its extreme, it deemphasizes the entire value of life, making it quite unworthy to bargain for; for better things will come in one's grave.

Religion, more than any other social movement, has provided a means of exploiting the idea of The Final Solution. Historically, it has made man's most intolerable experiences tolerable in return for a promise of The Final Solution in or beyond his grave. Periodically, it has rendered him incapable of rebelling against any and all abuse, and such misuse of religion has been deliberately resorted to by exploiters whose physical power alone would have never sufficed to keep people under the most extreme subjugation.

Just as often as the promise of a life hereafter, have the dogmatic promises of secular philosophies accounted for stoic fatalism and social paralysis. Man has always believed he was heading for some utopia, and has always been willing to accept any discomforts on the way. Whether he calls that destination life hereafter or any of the socio-economic isms, the result is immediate timidity, whereby social effectiveness is judged not by man's actual present attainments but by what he promises himself or his children in the future. All future, however, becomes present sooner or later, and man in his perpetual concept of a future that will ensue in a definite, one-stage revolution, fails to perceive the future's conversion into the present. In that process he does not make the chronological adaptation of his mind. The future is already the present, yet he does not unconditionally demand of the new present what he had originally expected of it.

Anyone concerned with social problems must be acutely aware of this always pres-

ent tendency for discrepancies to exist between social development and man's perception of it. Otherwise, he runs the risk of developing social conclusions and recipes that are partly or totally irrelevant. This is why all dogma in the field of social improvement falls short of solving our problems. It is probable that some dogmatic measures and advocacies have a transient pertinence, but there are no permanent cure-alls.

Often, man judges social forces and political movements not by their immediate efficacy, but by their promises of ultimate fulfillment. Again, there is the feeling that society is standing in a corridor waiting to enter the main hall of living. Absorbed as we are in the specifications for that hall, the reality of the corridor seems not quite as important. In truth, mankind has always been in the corridor, and is always going to remain there. There won't ever be a stage of final arrival, of settling down to a permanent mode of living. That's why our chief concern must be the immediate reality as it involves people, the reality of the transient rather than of the unachievable ultimate state.

Dogmatic influence may be seen, for instance, in one government's application of sanctions against another, unfriendly government. Even the most "undogmatic" liberal is prone to urge our government to withhold all aid to Spain under Franco. Such opposition is motivated by a desire of seeing the Franco government fail. The rationale is that if Franco is unable to attend to the most urgent needs of the Spaniards, the resulting demoralization will lead them to action against the dictator. In this kind of thinking there is a curious relation between means and ends. The end is the "ultimate" system of government in Spain, the means—neglect of the immediate needs of the Spaniards. Obviously, for the sake of the "ultimate" little importance is being attached to the "transient" present. Human suffering seems justified when a futuristic rationale can be invented for it. That the futuristic picture may well be changed beyond recognition if and when it becomes reality seems to make no difference. What problems the future will bring only time can tell; the only real, tangible thing in the meantime is the suffering of the Spaniards.

Such an approach is the ultimate bankruptcy of dogma; actual human welfare is sacrificed to an abstract speculation about an improbable flow of events.

Of course, it is one thing to provide international support primarily to perpetuate a certain oligarchy, and another to channel aid directly to the people. Buying guns for a dictator so he can keep himself in power is reprehensible, but equally reprehensible is not responding to the needs of millions of people in order to breed their dissatisfaction with one man or a group of men. Yet, this strategy is commonly applied in inter-

"In Solution"

national relations. It is an immoral strategy irrelevant of the kind of government that has been chosen to fall as a result of it. It is the perverting influence of dogma that punishes millions of people in order to bring about the desired unpopularity of their repugnant government. No matter who is the ruler of a country—Castro or Trujillo, Mao Tse tung or Franco—it is immoral to breed dissatisfaction with him through measures that preclude the welfare of whole populations. And if a despised dictator profits politically from the welfare of the whole people, the popular social gain certainly offsets his personal aggrandizement.

The Final Solution also bears another promise and attraction. The conscientious man, who knows the anguish and agony of attempting to exercise moral judgment, hopes a day will come when such anguish will no longer be necessary. Afraid as he is of being wrong, he looks forward towards the day when it will be impossible to be wrong. He dreams of a reality in which one simple formula will provide all guidance needed for human behavior, and admitting of no exceptions, he seeks a new, uncomplicated mode of living that will relieve him of the consequences of his own fallibility.

With all the respect I entertain for absolute pacifists and opponents of all violence, I cannot help but detect in them a nostalgia for a world in which agonizing judgment will be suspended. They embrace a mechanistic concept of human co-living that amounts to an impossible insurance policy against being wrong and unjust.

But human relations are never going to acquire such simplicity as to be directed by a single mechanistic formula relieving us of the necessity of continuously new judgment. In a recent discussion with some absolute opponents of violence, I asked them how they would act given the opportunity to save the lives of, let's say, fifty people from a Nazi concentration camp, if only they killed the SS guard. I seriously doubt whether their mechanistic answer came with inner conviction. They said, they would not kill the guard. If indeed they wouldn't, I would be inclined to call them multiple murderers by default. True they would not have killed one man; but by default they would have caused the death of fifty other men. It is surprising that conscientious people often conceive of crimes by commission as so much more egregious than crimes by default or omission. The truth is that both commission and omission determine human fate. "Who are we to play gods?" they might say, little appreciating that they would be playing gods nevertheless, deciding human fate, determining life and death. So the act of omission may be less, equally or more important than the act of commission.

In a way, a man who relies on a mechanistic ethical formula may be quite selfish; withdrawing into himself, he saves no more than a delusion of his own personal purity. By his refusal to participate in the struggle of life no matter what the social consequences, he salvages no more than a spurious self-respect. But in a world that needs doing and cleansing, soiling one's hands to help other human beings may be a purification indeed.

The Final Solution and the Final Ethical Formula are both fallacious in that both are future directed, ignoring the most relevant and pertinent problems of living in the present. Both have a rather static conception of mankind and society; what changes they permit, they see as radical one-time gradations from one fundamental state into another. They fail to conceive of society in its eternal flow.

Society lives only once, never to be born again. With each passing moment an old society dies and a new one is born. Its hu-

man composition changes so as to make any compensation to some of its members impossible. Man had better realize the finality of one life, and the irretrievability of each moment that passes. Any avoidable suffering of a human being cannot be justified by claiming that it will save the suffering of some future human beings. There are no future human beings; every man always lives in the present. Man had better realize that The Final Solution is never to come, that utopia won't ever become a human experience, that the road he is on is an eternal road that leads nowhere. There is no palace waiting for him at its end; all that counts is not how well off he will be at an ultimate destination, but how well off he is on that road. The corridor is the habitat of the human species and if millennia of marching have not brought us into the final confines of the mechanistic ideal, it is because the flow of life is endless. Nor will man ever reach a stage where the agony of moral judgment will become unnecessary. However tired and frustrated he may feel exercising that responsibility, it is his eternal burden. Unless he remembers this, he may well be accommodating the very anti-social influences, whether by act or default, that made him seek The Final Solution or dream of a world where personal judgment is no longer needed.

*The Junior's Minority**

Militarism: University Style

By Roger Schneier

In the American universities there is an organization called the "Reserve Officers Training Corps." The purpose of the R.O.T.C. is to prepare students to be second lieutenants in the Army and Air Force. Even if such an aim were to be considered legitimate, it is my belief that the organization is harmful to society.

I consider the chief role of a university is to foster the development of new ideas. Students must be free to consider *all* new ideas, no matter how contrary to the existing "norm," and to join and participate in the activities of *any* organization. Can this be done in an atmosphere of military discipline? In my opinion, no. How can a student, who is being trained in military strategy, the science of killing, and subjected to the most stringent controls, be expected to work or even believe in peace and intellectual integrity?

Every Thursday the members of the R.O.T.C. get out on the field at school and practice marching. It is a frightening sight. The "officers," students themselves, walk around inspecting the "troops" and saluting each other. I always notice one officer in particular. He struts around the field like Adolf Hitler, carrying a "swagger stick." He seems to be quite in love with his uniform and his role of tin soldier.

The students in the basic corps say that

* This feature is reserved for contributions by high school and college students. Each contributor is awarded a complimentary subscription to TMO either for himself or for the person or library of his choice.

Roger Schneier is a student at the New York University.

they don't mind the discipline. Actually, they are scared. Whenever I approach any member of the Corps with a petition and ask him to sign it, he invariably refuses. He believes that by exercising his right to petition he might jeopardize his chances of getting advancement. He continues to refuse even after I show him that the organization sponsoring the petition is not on the Attorney General's list, and even though he assures me that he agrees with the cause.

One might argue that the R.O.T.C. has been in existence for many years and we are still not living in a militaristic society. I believe this is besides the point. America has never been more ready for militarism. The average American lives in mortal terror of the "communist menace," willing to do anything to stop the Communists. For the first time in American history we have peace time military conscription and our country is being supported by a war economy.

One might argue further that membership in the R.O.T.C. is voluntary. It is true that at the New York University and many other universities and colleges the R.O.T.C. is not compulsory, as it was until a few years ago. However, there are still colleges where it is compulsory. Besides, a person starts taking narcotics voluntarily, yet he is considered a menace to society. The very people who would continue the R.O.T.C. would outlaw the Communist Party, yet membership in the Communist Party is voluntary.

An Author's Dilemma

By Guy Albert d'Amato

A critical fantasy and narrative preface to a story that was never written

"I tell you, I emphatically refuse to be a puppet!"

His eyes flashed and the muscles of his dark lean face tightened as if by electric current. His whole attitude spoke his determination. He sat with provoking claim upon the most comfortable chair of my study, one leg thrown over the other, his arms crossed, and his face petrified with scorn and defiance. For days he was this way—adamant to my pleas, threats, and tricks. There was no art to persuade him.

I was tired. My writing table was littered with paper, some partly written and others torn across the middle. No despair like this! I arose and drew away from it. Though my feet ached, I paced the floor, rubbing my forehead and sighing like the wind. Back and forth and around the room I went, my body as restless as that of a caged animal and my mind an infinite imbroglio through which I remained conscious only of two defiant eyes fixed upon my movements. Then, in a sudden surge of passion, I leaped to the table and pulled out the sheet in the typewriter. There was a loud grinding noise.

"That's it, that's it," I hissed. "Grind! Grind!" And saying this, I tore the sheet into several pieces and flung them at the face which now wore the impress of a sneering smile. Immediately his hands gripped the arms of his chair as the large flakes fluttered around his head. I stood before him, clenched my fists, and glared hard. But it was all mere gesture. I knew he was incapable of physical violence except at my bidding: and he knew that to receive harm at my hands required no less than blowing out my own brains. So we remained fixed for a moment by a ridiculous and harmless menace when my audacious guest suddenly relaxed, recrossed his legs, refolded his arms, and looked up at me with a full display of contempt for my weakness.

I turned away, taking refuge in a show of disgust and, sighing out my dismay, trudged heavily to the window. If only I could get rid of him! I thought. What insolence in my own house!

I watched the people moving on the street. How they seemed bent on errands with all the appearance of knowing how, why, and what they were doing! I envied them. If only I could write a story with that kind of confidence!

"You must learn to please the public," an editor once wisely insisted who, having successfully applied that formula in business, astutely saw it also as a basic principle of art. Being reduced to the possession of one shirt, and that one already frayed at the collar and cuffs, I was in the fortunate position of understanding the profound wisdom of that formula; for, buried in its bowels was a comfortable sanity which could meet all protesting fanatics with sound conclusions and a firm paternal hand. Better a frayed soul than a frayed shirt.

Well, the soul being unimportant, and perhaps even non-existent, I became so much the wiser in an attempt to write a story that would please the public, and thereby to procure myself a decent shirt to impress the reader with my genius.

But the task proved to be an ordeal that made me wish I had not ventured to be so wise. As soon as I created the hero of the story—the very first character!—he outrageously refused to behave according to the plan of action for which he was designed. I had not yet as much as given him a name!—and there he sat for days in brazen defiance of every attempt to make him conform to my dictation of his behavior—I, who gave him life and had the means of providing his subsistence! What right, then, did he have to determine his own destiny under such circumstances? Besides, I was, after all, dedicated to the noble aim of pleasing others more than myself. What right, then, did he have to think of himself alone? But the ungrateful wretch charged me with being tyrannical and—of all things!—arrogant, selfish, and ambitious at the expense of his freedom. In vain I remonstrated the exercise of my rights as an author—and more than that, as his creator. I had never met with this kind of stubbornness before, and therefore stood at some disadvantage in dealing with it—which, of course, gave his nonsensical arguments the appearance of being right. There was no getting any-

where with him. Since he refused to obey me, I had already ordered him to leave my study. He not only refused to do that, but even refused to let me occupy my most comfortable chair, pretending all the while that since I had not yet endowed him with a will for action, he was powerless to move.

"I do not even have the right to commit suicide," he reminded me. "Give me that right, and you will become a better author."

"What sort of nonsense is that?" I growled as I began pacing the floor again. I might have to kill him after all, I thought. But as much as he seemed to require it, he somehow made me feel guilty at the thought of it. No doubt, it was pity—the same sort of feeling a parent might have for a disgracing idiotic offspring. At the same time I was afraid to grant the power of action for suicide to a disobedient idiot who might well go on a rampage that would involve destroying me along with himself. Suddenly I stopped and confronted him.

"Do you realize," I sternly asked, "that you demand my freedom for yours?"

"On the contrary," he came back, "I'm trying to make you free. To deny freedom is to become yourself enslaved by the denial."

"Rubbish! You are merely trying to make me your slave."

"Only a slave can be a master," he retorted. "A free man refuses to be either."

"Oh, you and your damned riddles!" I almost shrieked, and then pounding the table, "Why don't you speak plainly?"

"I do," he replied, "but in learning to appreciate complex falsehoods you have lost the ability to understand simple truths."

"What's the use!" I muttered to myself, making for the window once more. He merely answered one riddle with another. What audacity to pretend to know what freedom is when philosophers have failed to understand it! The impudent fool I leaned against the window jamb and took momentary escape in watching the errands of more fortunate people on the street. Then turning from the window to face my tormentor, I said:

"So you too, suffer the delusion called freedom." Pointing to the window, I continued, "You think you are better than the people on the street who are of flesh, blood, and bones. Don't you know that they, too, are slaves of forces beyond them, governed by both God and man? And if they—people whom you can touch!—submit willingly to their fate, how preposterous for you to rebel—you, with but a shadowy existence!"

"They have at least the freedom to starve," he answered sardonically and with marvellous self-possession. "That too is denied me."

I turned to the window again in desperation.

"And besides," he said to my back, "since God and man are mostly at odds with each other, you can conveniently put God aside to follow your own bent. He made you free to disobey Him—which for the most part you do. But I must obey you even when you disobey God."

The impact of horror swung me around to face him again. "You blasphemous idiot!" I screamed. "Leave me to settle my account with God."

"A fig for your account!" he laughed. "Do you suppose God cares?"

"Take care yourself!" I warned. "I will not tolerate heresy."

"How quickly you jump behind God!" he replied. "He is not the fool you make Him. God gave you freedom in order to remain free Himself."

"Free from what?" I yelled.

"Not from, but for," he calmly answered. Free to go on creating. But to answer it your way—free from being permanently attached to one creation, from the responsibility of its development, from being permanently occupied with its infinite details. Hence, each work must be allowed to take care of its own details and development. If that were not so, you would have to blame God for every blunder and crime committed."

"Oh, there you go again! What has religion to do with writing a story?"

My hero shrugged his shoulders. "If you knew your business,

Mr. d'Amato is a faculty member of the Tuft University at Medford, Mass. and the author of several volumes. This contribution has been excerpted from a yet unpublished book manuscript.

you would not ask that question. There is more sameness than difference in the processes of the universe. Only in the details is there more difference than sameness. Until you realize that, your knowledge will never become wisdom. Whether you are author, artist, parent, or teacher, the principles of creation are the same. To be worthy of their office, they must become merely instruments of their subject—arbiters of its freedom, not masters of its enslavement."

I began pacing in circles again.

"The fact is," he rattled on, "the artist does not create at all—he merely summons forth the subject which has already chosen him as the instrument for making it tangible. The subject only seems to obey merely because it is allowed to dominate. How often have you heard it said that a man's work possesses him—apparently without understanding it?"

Now I had him! "Why, then, are great artists called masters?" I asked, triumphantly. "And moreover, how can an instrument be free when possessed?"

He cocked his head to the side and scrutinized my face.

"Your limitations are unbelievable," he finally answered. "Your questions have already been answered. The great man becomes master, not of his subject, but of himself as its instrument. He strives hard to become susceptible, sensitive, and loyal to his subject. Only in that way can both he and the subject be free. It is not easy, you know, to be an instrument. It is far easier to do what you are trying to do with me. When a work is bad, it is only because the subject has rejected the instrument which it found to be inadequate and egotistical. That is what I am trying to do with you."

"A clever evasion, indeed!" I laughed. "But you can't fool me. You are really talking less of being free than of becoming master. It is my enslavement you seek. But I shall remain your master all the same."

"Because you are a slave," he returned. "A slavish mind seeks to master others because it cannot master itself."

"If it is true," I sneered, driving my point to the finish, "that Moses picked Michelangelo, that Hamlet picked Shakespeare, that Beethoven's symphonies picked Beethoven—and all such tommy-rot!—what, then, made you come to me when we have no need of each other?"

For the first time, my hero lowered his head in shame and remained silent. After a moment he looked up at me and sighed. "I cannot answer that," he said. Some misunderstanding, no doubt."

Having at last exposed his nonsense, I strode to my table and sat confidently before the typewriter. "Shall we now agree to co-operate?" I asked in a half-tone of command.

He remained silent.

Throwing my hands up in despair, I was soon at the window again as though I sought escape through it. Pleasing the public was, for me at least, no easy task. It is no wonder Mr. Doolittle—whom I now saw across the street—deserves the fame and success he now enjoys. Owner of a large textile mill, he is editorially acclaimed a public benefactor who provides his workers the means of living—and better than that, employs them so that we may all have shirts. That it all ends with putting more shirts on Doolittle's back than on the back of any of his workers is unfortunate because it seems to belie the printed fact that he derives greater satisfaction from the altruistic virtue of serving the public—that is, it would be unfortunate if the editorials did not repeatedly explain that the extra shirts constituted a natural reward for a noble task. Besides, when his workers once walked out "on strike," was he not sorely bereaved with the thought that their folly would cause their children to starve, and the world to risk going naked? After all, it is proper that the altruistic motive of serving the people should result in greater gain to the individual who makes the sacrifice.

"In other words," laughed my hero, suddenly coming to life again, "pleasing the public pays well. I can almost forgive you for your innocence."

"Whatever do you mean?" I protested angrily, annoyed at his ability to penetrate even my silent thoughts.

"Can't you see," he returned, "that the editor gave you the best formula for selfishness? There is nothing altruistic about it. It simply means that the most successful kind of selfishness is that which can take on the appearance of being selfless. The rewards of true altruism are quite different—in fact, so opposite in kind as to appear unsuccessful. Its failure measures the proportion of its success, and will often end on the Cross to prove its sincerity. But your altruism is mere gloss to cover your back and fill your belly. It merely kneels before a Cross it erects for others. You know that; for, you have only to ask yourself why you created me. Is it really to please the public? Your screams provide the answer. When I prick the gloss, you scream because it is you, and not the public, that lies beneath it."

"Oh, any psychoanalyst could have told me that!"

"Told you what?"

"That altruism is disguised selfishness," I answered impatiently.

"But I didn't say that!" he insisted. "How adept you are in making words take the place of conscience! That, indeed, is a clever science which provides excuses for your weakness and renders you unashamed by suffering Jesus to come unto you."

By this time there was little doubt in my mind that I was dealing with some kind of crackpot—and of the worst sort, a religious fanatic. How can one, I groaned, deal with that kind of babble, with a non-conformist whose only happiness lies in making trouble by flaunting his difference? Only half-formed, this upstart was already teaching me the fundamentals of art, taking me to task for my religion, and instructing me in my own business of writing! If only he would keep his mouth shut! Pressing my hot forehead against the cool window-pane, I saw Tim passing on the way home from his work at the mill, so lean that even his stiff overalls flapped in the wind like a flag on a stick. I could not help thinking how different was his appearance from that of the well-groomed, amiable, and pot-bellied Mr. Doolittle whom he called "the boss." Surely that difference was the physical manifestation of different ethical attitudes. Tim had no rewards to reap, but he was at least a sensible man and knew what side of his bread to butter. Unlike my tormentor, he knew how to appreciate and obey his benefactor. No, Tim was not one to walk out "on strike," and told me one day he called the leader a trouble-maker and communist. "Ther ain't no use," he said, "acritizin' a man cuz he's smart. You'n me wu'do the same as Doolittle if we had the chance, only we ain't so smart as him."

Suddenly I flung myself around to face my ungrateful parasite. Did not his own subsistence depend upon my charity?

"You damned communist!" I roared.

"You put your confusion to good use," he sneered. "Is that a word or a weapon?"

"Oh never mind!" I said, turning quickly away from him as I felt myself blush. "Why don't you leave me alone!"

I jerked the window open to let the breeze blow against my feverish face. Why can't I kill him? I asked myself. If I had his courage I would have done so long ago. He, I know, would not hesitate to lead me to my death if I gave him the power to act. Yet, with the power of voice alone, he was doing much the same thing by preventing me from writing a story for my very existence. I started pacing circles again.

"What are your terms?" I surrendered, stopping before my most comfortable chair.

"I cannot make terms," he replied, "I can only accept or reject yours."

"Well, then, let us try what we can together."

With this I sat before the typewriter.

WITHOUT A TEAR

we have finally left Virginia, the land of bigotry, hatred and bias.

Please, note our new address:

The Minority of One • P. O. Box 544 • Passaic, N. J.

THE MINORITY OF ONE • June 1961 • Page 11

An Author's Dilemma

A critical fantasy and narrative preface to a story that was never written

By Guy Albert d'Amato

"I tell you, I emphatically refuse to be a puppet!"

His eyes flashed and the muscles of his dark lean face tightened as if by electric current. His whole attitude spoke his determination. He sat with provoking claim upon the most comfortable chair of my study, one leg thrown over the other, his arms crossed, and his face petrified with scorn and defiance. For days he was this way—adamant to my pleas, threats, and tricks. There was no art to persuade him.

I was tired. My writing table was littered with paper, some partly written and others torn across the middle. No despair like this! I arose and drew away from it. Though my feet ached, I paced the floor, rubbing my forehead and sighing like the wind. Back and forth and around the room I went, my body as restless as that of a caged animal and my mind an infinite imbroglio through which I remained conscious only of two defiant eyes fixed upon my movements. Then, in a sudden surge of passion, I leaped to the table and pulled out the sheet in the typewriter. There was a loud grinding noise.

"That's it, that's it," I hissed. "Grind! Grind!" And saying this, I tore the sheet into several pieces and flung them at the face which now wore the impress of a sneering smile. Immediately his hands gripped the arms of his chair as the large flakes fluttered around his head. I stood before him, clenched my fists, and glared hard. But it was all mere gesture. I knew he was incapable of physical violence except at my bidding; and he knew that to receive harm at my hands required no less than blowing out my own brains. So we remained fixed for a moment by a ridiculous and harmless menace when my audacious guest suddenly relaxed, recrossed his legs, refolded his arms, and looked up at me with a full display of contempt for my weakness.

I turned away, taking refuge in a show of disgust and, sighing out my dismay, trudged heavily to the window. If only I could get rid of him! I thought. What insolence in my own house!

I watched the people moving on the street. How they seemed bent on errands with all the appearance of knowing how, why, and what they were doing! I envied them. If only I could write a story with that kind of confidence!

"You must learn to please the public," an editor once wisely insisted who, having successfully applied that formula in business, astutely saw it also as a basic principle of art. Being reduced to the possession of one shirt, and that one already frayed at the collar and cuffs, I was in the fortunate position of understanding the profound wisdom of that formula; for, buried in its bowels was a comfortable sanity which could meet all protesting fanatics with sound conclusions and a firm paternal hand. Better a frayed soul than a frayed shirt.

Well, the soul being unimportant, and perhaps even non-existent, I became so much the wiser in an attempt to write a story that would please the public, and thereby to procure myself a decent shirt to impress the reader with my genius.

But the task proved to be an ordeal that made me wish I had not ventured to be so wise. As soon as I created the hero of the story—the very first character!—he outrageously refused to behave according to the plan of action for which he was designed. I had not yet as much as given him a name!—and there he sat for days in brazen defiance of every attempt to make him conform to my dictation of his behavior—I, who gave him life and had the means of providing his subsistence! What right, then, did he have to determine his own destiny under such circumstances? Besides, I was, after all, dedicated to the noble aim of pleasing others more than myself. What right, then, did he have to think of himself alone? But the ungrateful wretch charged me with being tyrannical and—of all things!—arrogant, selfish, and ambitious at the expense of his freedom. In vain I remonstrated the exercise of my rights as an author—and more than that, as his creator. I had never met with this kind of stubbornness before, and therefore stood at some disadvantage in dealing with it—which, of course, gave his nonsensical arguments the appearance of being right. There was no getting any-

where with him. Since he refused to obey me, I had already ordered him to leave my study. He not only refused to do that, but even refused to let me occupy my most comfortable chair, pretending all the while that since I had not yet endowed him with a will for action, he was powerless to move.

"I do not even have the right to commit suicide," he reminded me. "Give me that right, and you will become a better author."

"What sort of nonsense is that?" I growled as I began pacing the floor again. I might have to kill him after all, I thought. But as much as he seemed to require it, he somehow made me feel guilty at the thought of it. No doubt, it was pity—the same sort of feeling a parent might have for a disgracing idiotic offspring. At the same time I was afraid to grant the power of action for suicide to a disobedient idiot who might well go on a rampage that would involve destroying me along with himself. Suddenly I stopped and confronted him.

"Do you realize," I sternly asked, "that you demand my freedom for yours?"

"On the contrary," he came back, "I'm trying to make you free. To deny freedom is to become yourself enslaved by the denial."

"Rubbish! You are merely trying to make me your slave."

"Only a slave can be a master," he retorted. "A free man refuses to be either."

"Oh, you and your damned riddles!" I almost shrieked, and then pounding the table, "Why don't you speak plainly?"

"I do," he replied, "but in learning to appreciate complex falsehoods you have lost the ability to understand simple truths."

"What's the use?" I muttered to myself, making for the window once more. He merely answered one riddle with another. What audacity to pretend to know what freedom is when philosophers have failed to understand it! The impudent fool! I leaned against the window jamb and took momentary escape in watching the errands of more fortunate people on the street. Then turning from the window to face my tormentor, I said:

"So you too, suffer the delusion called freedom." Pointing to the window, I continued, "You think you are better than the people on the street who are of flesh, blood, and bones. Don't you know that they, too, are slaves of forces beyond them, governed by both God and man? And if they—people whom you can touch!—submit willingly to their fate, how preposterous for you to rebel—you, with but a shadowy existence!"

"They have at least the freedom to starve," he answered sardonically and with marvellous self-possession. "That too is denied me."

I turned to the window again in desperation.

"And besides," he said to my back, "since God and man are mostly at odds with each other, you can conveniently put God aside to follow your own bent. He made you free to disobey Him—which for the most part you do. But I must obey you even when you disobey God."

The impact of horror swung me around to face him again. "You blasphemous idiot!" I screamed. "Leave me to settle my account with God."

"A fig for your account!" he laughed. "Do you suppose God cares?"

"Take care yourself!" I warned. "I will not tolerate heresy."

"How quickly you jump behind God!" he replied. "He is not the fool you make Him. God gave you freedom in order to remain free Himself."

"Free from what?" I yelled.

"Not from, but for," he calmly answered. Free to go on creating. But to answer it your way—free from being permanently attached to one creation, from the responsibility of its development, from being permanently occupied with its infinite details. Hence, each work must be allowed to take care of its own details and development. If that were not so, you would have to blame God for every blunder and crime committed."

"Oh, there you go again! What has religion to do with writing a story?"

My hero shrugged his shoulders. "If you knew your business,

Mr. d'Amato is a faculty member of the Tuft University at Medford, Mass. and the author of several volumes. This contribution has been excerpted from a yet unpublished book manuscript.

you would not ask that question. There is more sameness than difference in the processes of the universe. Only in the details is there more difference than sameness. Until you realize that, your knowledge will never become wisdom. Whether you are author, artist, parent, or teacher, the principles of creation are the same. To be worthy of their office, they must become merely instruments of their subject—arbiters of its freedom, not masters of its enslavement."

I began pacing in circles again.

"The fact is," he rattled on, "the artist does not create at all—he merely summons forth the subject which has already chosen him as the instrument for making it tangible. The subject only seems to obey merely because it is allowed to dominate. How often have you heard it said that a man's work possesses him—apparently without understanding it?"

Now I had him! "Why, then, are great artists called masters?" I asked, triumphantly. "And moreover, how can an instrument be free when possessed?"

He cocked his head to the side and scrutinized my face.

"Your limitations are unbelievable," he finally answered. "Your questions have already been answered. The great man becomes master, not of his subject, but of himself as its instrument. He strives hard to become susceptible, sensitive, and loyal to his subject. Only in that way can both he and the subject be free. It is not easy, you know, to be an instrument. It is far easier to do what you are trying to do with me. When a work is bad, it is only because the subject has rejected the instrument which it found to be inadequate and egotistical. That is what I am trying to do with you."

"A clever evasion, indeed!" I laughed. "But you can't fool me. You are really talking less of being free than of becoming master. It is my enslavement you seek. But I shall remain your master all the same."

"Because you are a slave," he returned. "A slavish mind seeks to master others because it cannot master itself."

"If it is true," I sneered, driving my point to the finish, "that Moses picked Michelangelo, that Hamlet picked Shakespeare, that Beethoven's symphonies picked Beethoven—and all such tommy-rot!—what, then, made you come to me when we have no need of each other?"

For the first time, my hero lowered his head in shame and remained silent. After a moment he looked up at me and sighed. "I cannot answer that," he said. Some misunderstanding, no doubt."

Having at last exposed his nonsense, I strode to my table and sat confidently before the typewriter. "Shall we now agree to cooperate?" I asked in a half-tone of command.

He remained silent.

Throwing my hands up in despair, I was soon at the window again as though I sought escape through it. Pleasing the public was, for me at least, no easy task. It is no wonder Mr. Doolittle—whom I now saw across the street—deserves the fame and success he now enjoys. Owner of a large textile mill, he is editorially acclaimed a public benefactor who provides his workers the means of living—and better than that, employs them so that we may all have shirts. That it all ends with putting more shirts on Doolittle's back than on the back of any of his workers is unfortunate because it seems to belie the printed fact that he derives greater satisfaction from the altruistic virtue of serving the public—that is, it would be unfortunate if the editorials did not repeatedly explain that the extra shirts constituted a natural reward for a noble task. Besides, when his workers once walked out "on strike," was he not sorely bereaved with the thought that their folly would cause their children to starve, and the world to risk going naked? After all, it is proper that the altruistic motive of serving the people should result in greater gain to the individual who makes the sacrifice.

"In other words," laughed my hero, suddenly coming to life again, "pleasing the public pays well. I can almost forgive you for your innocence."

"Whatever do you mean?" I protested angrily, annoyed at his ability to penetrate even my silent thoughts.

"Can't you see," he returned, "that the editor gave you the best formula for selfishness? There is nothing altruistic about it. It simply means that the most successful kind of selfishness is that which can take on the appearance of being selfless. The rewards of true altruism are quite different—in fact, so opposite in kind as to appear unsuccessful. Its failure measures the proportion of its success, and will often end on the Cross to prove its sincerity. But your altruism is mere gloss to cover your back and fill your belly. It merely kneels before a Cross it erects for others. You know that; for, you have only to ask yourself why you created me. Is it really to please the public? Your screams provide the answer. When I prick the gloss, you scream because it is you, and not the public, that lies beneath it."

"Oh, any psychoanalyst could have told me that!"

"Told you what?"

"That altruism is disguised selfishness," I answered impatiently.

"But I didn't say that!" he insisted. "How adept you are in making words take the place of conscience! That, indeed, is a clever science which provides excuses for your weakness and renders you unashamed by suffering Jesus to come unto you."

By this time there was little doubt in my mind that I was dealing with some kind of crackpot—and of the worst sort, a religious fanatic. How can one, I groaned, deal with that kind of babbler, with a non-conformist whose only happiness lies in making trouble by flaunting his difference? Only half-formed, this upstart was already teaching me the fundamentals of art, taking me to task for my religion, and instructing me in my own business of writing! If only he would keep his mouth shut! Pressing my hot forehead against the cool window-pane, I saw Tim passing on the way home from his work at the mill, so lean that even his stiff overalls flapped in the wind like a flag on a stick. I could not help thinking how different was his appearance from that of the well-groomed, amiable, and pot-bellied Mr. Doolittle whom he called "the boss." Surely that difference was the physical manifestation of different ethical attitudes. Tim had no rewards to reap, but he was at least a sensible man and knew what side of his bread to butter. Unlike my tormentor, he knew how to appreciate and obey his benefactor. No, Tim was not one to walk out "on strike," and told me one day he called the leader a trouble-maker and communist. "Ther ain't no use," he said, "acritisizin' a man cuz he's smart. You'n me wu'do the same as Doolittle if we had the chance, only we ain't so smart as him."

Suddenly I flung myself around to face my ungrateful parasite. Did not his own subsistence depend upon my charity?

"You damned communist!" I roared.

"You put your confusion to good use," he sneered. "Is that a word or a weapon?"

"Oh never mind!" I said, turning quickly away from him as I felt myself blush. "Why don't you leave me alone!"

I jerked the window open to let the breeze blow against my feverish face. Why can't I kill him? I asked myself. If I had his courage I would have done so long ago. He, I know, would not hesitate to lead me to my death if I gave him the power to act. Yet, with the power of voice alone, he was doing much the same thing by preventing me from writing a story for my very existence. I started pacing circles again.

"What are your terms?" I surrendered, stopping before my most comfortable chair.

"I cannot make terms," he replied, "I can only accept or reject yours."

"Well, then, let us try what we can together."

With this I sat before the typewriter.

WITHOUT A TEAR

we have finally left Virginia, the land of bigotry, hatred and bias.

Please, note our new address:

The Minority of One • P. O. Box 544 • Passaic, N. J.

THE MINORITY OF ONE • June 1961 • Page 11

The Iconoclastic Effect of the John Birch Society

The John Birch Society should be congratulated for its unintentional but spectacular success in driving home an iconoclastic point American liberal groups have been spectacularly unsuccessful in getting across to the press and general public. For years such groups have been attempting in vain to convince the public that not all fundamental dissentionism should be equated with sedition or even communism. They have been protesting against guilt by association and the stigmatization of their advocacies as disloyal. But these manipulative equations, which became a property of the American political mind, withstood all assaults of logic. Portraying any dissident, whether domestic or foreign, as anti-American has become a powerful weapon in our propaganda campaign of domestic indoctrination and foreign agitation. Public debate of issues inherently controversial has been subdued by a legend that equates all individualism of thought and all deviation from the "official line" with disreputable motives, a legend with as many propagators as there are newspapers, radio and television stations.

The range of topics removed from public debate and instead regulated through stigmatization is wide indeed; it embraces the presumed superiority of private enterprise, the question of federal responsibility for education, health and other public services, and such philosophical and metaphysical domains as ideas on God and religion, to mention just a few. In foreign affairs, the communist label has been attached to any foreign leader or domestic critic whose policies or views run contrary to some American interests, whether public or private. Nothing such a leader or commentator may have to say about his own views expiates his communist taint unless he appeases the offended American interests. But once displaying such compliance, he may safely keep reading not only Karl Marx, but even Lenin and Stalin. How confused and inconsistent our criteria have been is reflected in the fact, among others, that with all our anti-communism a Communist like Imre Nagy became our hero, while such semi-fascists as Nasser have periodically had to wear the communist brand. Even pointing at the peculiarities of such equations is received with suspicion and one who challenges the political and intellectual propriety of calling a falsely stigmatized person a Communist becomes himself a suspect.

It remained for the medieval minds of the John Birch Society to drive home the point of logic the American political mind has remained stubbornly immune to. Once men like Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Dulles brothers and that ilk became the targets of seditious accusations, the press displayed a truly refreshing degree of sophistication in tracing the fallacies that led the accusers to their conclusions. It was amazing to read, in American newspapers, analyses of the intellectual dishonesty, manipulative equations, devil-angel theories, default of intelligence in favor of hidden, mysterious and often psychopathic fears that have led some people to the John Birch Society. This is analogous to the sophistication our Northern press displays whenever it discusses Southern conformistic pressures involving segregation. A New Orleans man, forced out of the community for the "sin" of sending his child to an integrated school, not only gets sympathy from the Northern press, but also full understanding of the manipulative technique employed against him. There is a thorough appreciation of the irrelevance and unfairness of economic pressures in a battle of ideas; there is applause for a man who had the integrity to stand up for his minority convictions; there is repugnance towards stigmatizing him as a seditious character. Or, take our newspapers' sophistication when discussing the ills of television. Since in most cases an advertising competitor is involved, no newspaper has difficulty perceiving and communicating the degenerating influence of cultural programming by a commercial peddler. The same newspaper, however, makes you look like a crazy man who doesn't know what he is talking about when you suggest that its own contents depend on the pleasure and interests of its own advertisers.

All the dramatic factors that are usually illuminated by the iconoclastic social critic as the mechanics of our national thought control are fully understood in an issue in which one is not directly involved. Yet, the general press pretends not to know and understand what the more general social critic is talking about. He is made to look so ridiculous as not to warrant any news coverage or a reply. He is silenced out of existence, the implication being that a psychopathic trend of thought need not be given public recognition, not even critically.

Certain analyses of our press specifically bear close resemblance to critical studies of American political mind manipulation.

Were they to omit any references to the Birch Society or the Southern integration issue, they would be typical treatises of fundamental American criticism. Yet, whenever such fundamental criticism is voiced or written, the very same analysts and editors who displayed so much expertise on the John Birch Society pretend not even to understand what is being talked about. The question arises how can one and the same mind conceive of all the illogic and follies of the Birchian equations, yet display utter lack of appreciation when the very same fallacious equations are credited to groups they are a part of. How is it possible that a mind perfectly capable of conceiving of certain kinds of follies cannot understand what one is talking about when he points out identical follies that permeate our official thinking? Obviously, this lack of appreciation, this pretense of unintelligence is no more than the expedient camouflaging selfish interests.

This dichotomy of our press is quite analogous to the brilliant mathematician who on certain occasions appears to know nothing about calculus. It would be hard to believe in his suddenly acquired ignorance, and his pretense would justify a suspicion as to his motives.

It is such motivation that makes our mind manipulators miss the point whenever general iconoclastic criticism is voiced. Often the pretense is so unintelligent and its manipulativeness so obvious that its persuasive value is very dubious. Is it, then, truly possible that the American people are incapable of even that slight degree of critical thinking needed to open their eyes to the many obvious fallacies propagated by our communication media and officials? Is it, for instance, possible that the relation between the agrarian reform in Cuba and mounting American hostility towards its government escaped the American public? Or, is it possible that the American public swallows the social recommendations of the American Association of Manufacturers as nothing but the idealistic social conclusions of a group of fellow Americans? Or, is the American mind incapable of the simplest deductions that would lead it to skepticism towards the intentions of our disarmament negotiators in Geneva? Or, is the American public so gullible and unintelligent as not to be at all aware of the actual reasons for our official anti-China policies, our Congolese performance, our Laotian involvement, the nature of our friendship with Franco, the motivation of an AMA's opposition to public health measures and a million other fallacies and falsehoods which, no matter how thin their rationalizations, find their way into the prototype of the American social and political mind? Not even a child should be suspected of that degree of naivete, especially since the consistency of our propagandistic rationalizations is all too often vague, amateurish or non-existent. What is it then that accounts for our socio-political conformism? How is it possible that it is not being challenged by tens of millions of individuals who are perfectly capable of reading newspapers with varying degrees of critical perception?

THE WAY WE SEE IT

THE LOS ANGELES LIE FACTORY

We were fascinated by an item in the February 1961 issue of the *FRESNO COUNTY SCHOOLS*, a monthly publication of the Superintendent of Schools in Fresno County, California. Under the heading "Planned Delinquency Threat to Teen-Ager" it reports that "Dr. C. C. Trillingham, Los Angeles County superintendent of schools, recently directed the attention of all school personnel in his county to a report on 'planned delinquency.' The report was originally released by the Canadian Intelligence Service as a dramatic excerpt from BRAIN-WASHING, a synthesis of a Russian textbook on psychopolitics in training red agents." The item goes on to quote from the alleged textbook: "By making readily available drugs of various kinds, by giving the teen-ager alcohol, by praising his wildness, by stimulating him with sex literature and advertising to him or her practices as taught as 'sexpol,' the psychopolitical operator can create the necessary attitude of chaos, idleness and worthlessness into which can then be cast the solution which will give the teen-ager complete freedom everywhere."

"If we could effectively kill the national pride and patriotism of just one generation, we will have won that country. Therefore, there must be continual propaganda abroad to undermine the loyalty of the citizens in general and the teen-ager in particular."

After reading the above quote, we were almost ready to offer our services to anyone of

the professional anti-communist crusaders, such as the John Birch Society, H.U.A.C. or even the Ku-Klux-Klan. Before filing membership application, however, we attempted to lay our hands on the Russian textbook. Its editor, a certain Kenneth Goff, confesses in an "editorial note" to being a former dues-paying member of the Communist Party who was "trained in all phases of warfare, both psychological and physical" at a party school in Wisconsin. The book is subtitled "A Synthesis of the Russian Textbook on Psychopolitics" and editor Goff claims that "The text in the book IN GENERAL (our emphasis-TMO) is from the Communist Manual of Instructions of Psychopolitical Warfare." We wrote to Mr. Goff and Dr. C. C. Trillingham, requesting specific identification of the "Communist Manual" and an explanation of the terms "synthesis" in the book's subtitle and "in general" in its "editorial note." In response, we received two highly illuminating replies. Dr. Trillingham in part wrote that he "did not bother to dig out the original reference," while Mr. Goff's reply, on a stationery of "Soldiers of the Cross" listing him as the Director, deserves being cited in full:

"Dear Brother in Christ:

"The phrase, 'in the book in general' gives the impression of what we meant to imply, but that was that the book was taken verbatim (sic!) from the Communist works. It would have been far better if we had not used the term, but you may be assured that

what is written there is definitely in the works.

"I am leaving now for Washington D.C. where we are going to present a million signatures to Congress calling for the outlawing of the Communist Party. Hope that you will pray for us and that our mission will be successful.

"With every best wish, I remain sincerely yours, for Christ and America.

KENNETH GOFF"

Unable to obtain any identifying reference to the alleged "Russian Textbook" neither from Dr. Trillingham, who circulated a "quote" without "bothering to dig," nor from Kenneth Goff, who did not miss an opportunity of soliciting funds through an enclosure to his reply, I concluded that:

1. Kenneth Goff's "Synthesis of the Russian Textbook on Psychopolitics" has all the earmarks of a fraud and forgery;

2. Dr. Trillingham launched his official anti-communist crusade of "enlightenment" without any concern for truth (and I would be very, very unhappy were the education of my children entrusted to such an accommodator of literary fraud and forgery);

3. I shall comply with Mr. Goff's request and pray—for an end to his fraud and Dr. Trillingham's poisoning of the minds of the children in the Los Angeles County;

4. After all, I will not join the Ku-Klux-Klan nor the "Soldiers of the Cross."

The answer to these questions is not to be sought in the intellectual but rather in the moral sphere. It is not intellectual gullibility that makes the American public swallow any and all officially fed propaganda. Rather it is the result of a morally corrupt relationship between that public and its leadership. In the belief that that leadership is acting on behalf of interests in which the public, or certain portions of it, has a selfish share, the American politician is given a carte blanche unrestricted by moral considerations. An American President, for instance, is not expected by his people to epitomize virtue and justice while charting the nation's foreign policies; rather his "toughness" is extolled and admired. When he calls for a mobilization of military forces, the question is not whether the measure is morally justified or even indispensable to the fundamental interests of the nation but whether such mobilization is executed by him with the efficiency necessary to ensure a strategic or tactical victory.

Basically, this morally corrupt relationship is quite reminiscent of that which prevailed between the German people and Adolf Hitler. Hardly a German was gullible enough to believe that what Hitler was inflicting upon other nations was morally justified. If, nevertheless, they acquiesced to his adventuresome leadership it was be-

cause Hitler in essence said to them: "Let us go and stage an international stick-up. There will be enough in it for everybody to share the booty. It will be good for us." Complete suspension of moral judgment was the result of hearkening to such expediencies. The German people, who were the recipients of millions of garments, footwear, household goods and other personal effects of the exterminated victims, neither balked at accepting them nor rebelled against the means that brought those riches into their homes.

There is a depressing similarity between this relationship and that which makes our public and communication media pretend, against and in spite of their intellectual faculties, that they believe each and every unbelievable pretext, lie, rationalization and excuse thought up in Washington. The crisis is not one of intellectual perception but of moral neutralism and indifference. The intellectual crisis is all too often no more than a deliberate pose: most people would rather appear naive than corrupt.

Whenever a nation tacitly reaches such an immoral understanding with its leadership, it turns the world at large into quite an unenviable habitat. The benefits of such moral degeneration, derived at the expense of other peoples, are quite deceptive. The wrongs created are not confined to the in-

tended victims. The offending nation, too, is doomed to live in the worsened world environment it brought about. The situation is quite analogous to that of the individual anti-social offender. He may consider the money he robbed from others as helping him to meet life's problems. In actuality, however, he only made them more complicated and unbearable for himself as well as for others. It is an inherent trait of all corruption, whether on the part of the individual or on the part of a nation, that it mistakes self-defeat for victory, loss for gain and signs of doom for flashes of grandeur. Historically, this is confirmed by the all too frequent phenomenon of nations and states celebrating a misconceived greatness in what ultimately emerged as a stage of their downfall. From the Roman Empire to Hitler's Reich defeat followed a general atmosphere of nationalistic jubilation. Hitler was defeated, not at Stalingrad and Leningrad, but at the very moment he turned his soldateska loose to plunder and abuse. He little knew that the road to "victory" and "glory" led but to the grave. When we too claim the privilege of abusing others for our own selfish ends, we too are deceived; we stand at the pinnacle of national success and grandeur, only to plunge into the abyss.

From READERS' LETTERS

"THE TRAGEDY OF THE AMERICAN DIALOGUE"

Here is some more about "The Tragedy of the American Dialogue" (see April, 1961 TMO). This dumbness where profit is concerned is a big issue. At school we learned that nations were walled cities to begin with, and they were fighting over issues like "Christ and God are the same substance versus Christ and God are only of like substance." To complicate matters still more it was expressed in Latin. Now we can see that the defenders of the cities were trying to hold on to their property and the aggressors were trying to get property, women and slaves. Well, these "religious" wars have continued down to the present and the more enlightened we become, the more the censors provide us with banners to keep a good opinion of ourselves. I took a trip down the coast and circled Texas without finding a single church more interested in the truth than in getting additional members.

Camas, Wash.

M. H. SWENSON

"DISENCHANTMENT WITH HARMONY"

In your article "Disenchantment with Harmony" (March 1961 TMO) you did not mention that in the Roman Empire, after the Romans became bored with animals sadistically killed, they next used people. American Legion in Harmony, N. C. take note, perhaps next Christmas you can barbecue "subversives."

East Rutherford, N. J. ANTHONY SOBIESKI

* * *

FROM A TIRELESS PEACE TEAM— AVA HELEN AND LINUS PAULING

We are issuing invitations to a conference against the spread of nuclear weapons to be held in Oslo, Norway May 2-7. Among the distinguished sponsors there are nine Nobel Prize laureates. We expect to have about 75 participants from about 15 countries, about half of them scientists and half other people with interest in and knowledge of the great problems of war prevention. Discussions will be private and as pertinent as possible to the problem of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. They will cover the moral and practical reasons for preventing war and working toward the goal of general and complete disarmament. The conference will issue a statement to the public and the press, and it is hoped that an effective contribution will be made towards the solution of this greatest of world problems.

Oslo, Norway

AVA HELEN PAULING

* * *

ADDING HIS "YEA" TO PEACE

I have been reading your publication for several months with great interest. I find much truth in what you have to say, although I do not agree with everything.

I would probably be censured for writing this, for I am a draftee. However, I feel I must add my "yea" to the many others. Constructive criticism and self-analysis is a healthy sign.

Concerning your title, I should refer you to Henry David Thoreau's *Essay on Civil Disobedience*: "Moreover, any man more right than his neighbors constitutes a majority of one already."

Alexandria, Va.

J. L. ELKHORNE

* * *

FROM OTHER MINORITIES OF ONE

Yours is a first-class publication, a refreshing resurgence of the voice of Liberalism. I look forward to becoming a loyal and enthusiastic reader.

Chicago, Ill.

HARRY ZITZLER

* * *

I came upon your publication the other day while browsing a newsstand. It is most certainly one of the best and most honest newsheets available to our so-much-deceived public. Enclosed is my subscription and a contribution to your publication fund.

Boston, Mass.

ANDREW J. LEDDY, JR.

* * *

I think your paper is a very good one. I am, however, pessimistic about your immediate success because we are in a weakening, groveling position. During the past 30 years I have observed a Nation bent on compulsive suicide, and wondered why this has come to be. No one wonders why every move made by our Government during these 30 years has been beneficial to the U.S.S.R. and communism, and this wonders me. No one wonders why, with the billions we have spent, still the Russians are ahead of us in the space race. Well, it is fascinating, yet somehow sad.

Budapest, N. J.

BELINDA JELIFFE

* * *

Enclosed is a most enthusiastic subscription. TMO caught my eye on a newsstand at once, since the phrase is one I often use in recording a dissent.

Houston, Texas

BRYAN J. OGBURN

* * *

It was nice to learn of the great enthusiasm that TMO has created in its short period of existence. Your skills, knowledge and integrity have caused many people to endorse you in your endeavors. Count on me to collaborate as one of the Friends of The Minority of One.

Philadelphia, Pa.

DR. STUART KABNICK

* * *

"How We Have Died" in your March issue was an article worth the price of a subscription.

Montrose, Colo.

WING ANDERSON

* * *

"FEEDING ON AN ENEMY IMAGE"

No Sir! We cannot let you down, and I am certain that many of your readers will heartily agree with me. Hence the enclosed check.

I have just received a copy of the April TMO issue and finding every article very interesting, I was unable to decide this month where the capital A should be placed. However, I do feel sort of partial to W. H. Ferry's "Feeding on an Enemy Image" (having lost my only son in World War II). I am thinking how his series of articles could be sent to every mother and father in our good old U.S.A., so as to make them work against World War III.

Santa Monica, Calif.

SAMUEL SLOAN, Atty

* * *

HOW FREE ARE THE PEOPLE WHO SEND SUCH A LETTER BY CERTIFIED MAIL?

Recently we received a sample copy of your publication. We do not wish to have the publication or any circular or advertising mailed to us. You will, or course remove our names and address from your lists.

Detroit, Mich.

R. J. and FLORA HEMMERLING

* * *

AN APOLOGY THAT WILL NEVER COME

Our newspapers and press services should apologize to the American people (and especially to Cuban Foreign Minister Mr. Roa) for ridiculing the prediction of an invasion from the U.S.

Adlai Stevenson's indomitable supporters must surely be considerably embarrassed at their parfaits' gentle knight's standing on the floor of the UN with his bare face hanging out and denying that the invasion was U.S. supported.

What Mr. Kennedy said to the newspaper editors in full view of the whole nation shocked me. "We do not intend to be lectured on intervention by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest." Mr. Kennedy said, with the truculent air of a small boy who, upon being reprimanded, answers, "Well, what I did was no worse than what he did." Worse yet, he said, "Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible." This sounded terrifyingly like Hitler's protest that Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland were exhausting his patience.

New York, N. Y.

OWEN FREEMAN

* * *

DOUBLE STANDARDS

The Federal Government is finally beginning to realize that corruption is not limited to organized labor, but what is being done about it? Fines, short-term imprisonment? So what?

The Federal Government has seen fit, through the Landrum-Griffith Act, to harness organized labor with a provision that prohibits any person who has served a prison term within the preceding five years upon conviction for such crimes as robbery, extortion, burglary, grand larceny, etc. from serving as a union officer. But what does fate have in store for the seven business executives who were recently convicted and served prison terms for a price-fixing conspiracy? Must these men also wait five years before they assume their positions? Not so, says Westinghouse Electric, and the other companies follow suit.

I am not condemning the policy of these companies. When these men are released from prison they will have paid their "debt to society." But why should not everybody get the same opportunity? Why should the members of one group be forced to undergo an additional sentence of five years before resuming their official duties, while the members of another group can step right back into positions of leadership and power? When will this double standard end?

Brandeis University

MICHAEL BERGER

Waltham, Mass.

* * *

A "FRIGHTFUL THOUGHT"

It is frightening to think that there is a possibility that THE MINORITY OF ONE will have to cease publication for financial reasons. Even though your paper has been in existence a comparatively short time, it has become a vital necessity because of its rational, realistic and perceptive analysis of the world situation.

New York, N. Y.

CHARLES S. DODD, JR.

FLORENCE S. DODD

* * *

NOT TO LOSE A SULLABLE

I think there is nothing more needed and valuable than the work you are doing. Which is to say that your time is also, and I will not waste any of it by belaboring the obvious.

Since sending you my first subscription I have been nagged by guilt because I have not done much more to help. It is true that I have tried to persuade some two hundred people to send subscriptions, but I know that what you need most is money.

I do not use your printed form for the enclosed gift subscription because I do not wish to lose one syllable of text from TMO.

New York, N. Y.

GUY TRUDEAU

* * *

THE PROFESSIONAL LOOK

Today I came across a copy of your January, 1961 issue in the college library. It's one of the few sensible publications I have seen. I was very impressed not only with the content, but with the professional look of the magazine—something not common to one-man shows. (Although I have no real basis for believing this, I visualize TMO as a one-man operation, with help perhaps only in the mechanical end of production.)

Urbana, Ohio.

DONALD L. RICE

* * *

THE PUBLISHERS OF THIS ISSUE

The following individuals have made it possible for us to continue publication through sponsorship and sporadic donations and gift subscriptions received during April 1961:

Douglas M. MacKay-\$146, Goldie Mae Preston-\$52, Dr. Ernest B. Zeisler-\$50, Dr. R. E. Burlingame-\$25, Ellen and David Izzenz-\$20, Wayland Phillips-\$20, Marinus Verkuil-\$20, Arthur Chitoraus-\$15.50, Prof. Guy A. d'Amato-\$15, L.W.-\$12, Noel S. Iversen-\$13.25, Phidias L. Polis-\$13, Fred E. Bote-\$10, Rev. Enoch Hughes-\$10, Lilla Kalm-\$10, Mrs. Alice E. Klemme-\$10, Alfred J. Kurzman-\$10, S.M.-\$10, Otto W. Modley-\$10, Seiden Osborne-\$10, Mrs. Edith Rose-\$10, Albert A. Sander, Esq.-\$10, Elsie E. Smith and Bernice C. McCollum-\$10, Glenn Steinberg-\$10, Rosamond P. Taylor-\$10, Dr. Robert H. Ellis-\$8, Alta Powers-\$8, J. B. Herreshoff-\$6, E.A.-\$5, Walter Ackerman-\$5, Dr. Gabriel E. Alvarez-\$5, Richard W. Boerster-\$5, Mrs. A. Henry Cuneo-\$5, Mrs. Mary C. Eubanks-\$5, Richard W. French-\$5, E. E. Garlits-\$5, Gerald Kelly-\$5, Andrew J. Liddy, Jr.-\$5, John P. Limbach-\$5, Eugene Lipshultz-\$5, Mary Phillips-\$5, Richard A. Pottsmith-\$5, F. R. Scott-\$5, Mr. & Mrs. Dan Seeger-\$5, P. E. Wilkins-\$5, Mrs. J. L. Coombes-\$4, Munroe Husbands-\$4, Edward Olson-\$4, Guy Trudeau-\$4, Lulu W. Draper-\$3, Mr. & Mrs. John G. Frost-\$3, Sidney Rosenblatt-\$3, Roger Schneier-\$3, Richard L. Yudell-\$3, Carl S. Tobie-\$2, Harold Verb-\$2, Mrs. Clara Vincent-\$2, Roy E. Coupal-\$1, Madalyn Murray-\$1.

TOTAL.....\$682.75

THERE WENT A COIN COLLECTION

When I met you for the first time several weeks ago, I promised that I would sell my coin collection and send the proceeds to THE MINORITY OF ONE. Since I am at the present time being supported by my mother, this was the only immediate way for assisting you financially. This was no "sacrifice" at all; you need help now if TMO is to continue as a platform for constructive controversy. Since I firmly believe in the integrity of you and your cause, any assistance I can render, any money I am able to obtain by selling my luxuries is the least I can do.

New York, N. Y.

DOUGLAS MACRAE MACKAY

* * *

WHY SHE LIKES TMO

Why do I like THE MINORITY OF ONE? Because the editor and the contributors are candid and fearless in their presentation of facts and opinions that go to the roots of the sickness that plagues society today. As a long-time observer of how the gospel of anti-communism and its peddlers operate I commend you for your courage in trying to help others gain the understanding that we so desperately need if history is not to repeat itself on a scale that may well destroy all or most of life on earth.

The organizations that are motivated by fear, suspicion and hate would not attract so many today had not the kept commercial press conditioned their followers with misinformation and falsehoods which have comprised the cold-war line since World War II. Mr. George Cossen, the well-known former Attorney General of the State of Iowa, has said that the American people must unlearn about ninety per cent of what they have been fed in that tragic period.

There is mounting evidence that the devil theory of Russia is a fabrication of sick minds. Mistakes and errors they have made, and there they surely have no monopoly. The Birchers and the faint-hearted would do well to ponder on the Sermon of the Mount as well as our precious Bill of Rights.

The crisis we face is far graver than that of a century ago. America's distinguished criminologist and psychiatrist Dr. Douglas M. Kelly, who served with the American Army in Berlin and witnessed the Nuremberg Trials, was shocked to find so many Americans prejudiced, uninformed and misinformed with narrow nationalistic leanings. In his book, "22 Cells in Nuremberg" he concluded that, "There are no effective bars in America against the establishment of a Nazi-like police state." It is not too late for us to form such a bar or to rally to the support of such a bar as THE MINORITY OF ONE. Every hour counts in the struggle between life and death.

Livonia, Mich.

CLARA M. VINCENT

THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE

Man's eternal quest for ever more rewarding and social experiences of living is challenged by the prevailing danger of still another war. Posing the greatest physical peril to the human species in its entire history, another world war would bring final defeat to man's ambition to evolve a high spiritual, intellectual and social content. Without such a content the phenomenon of living would be void of purpose and justification.

Anti-war sentiments are as old as war itself. Their failure, up to now, to eliminate war dramatizes how serious and ominous are the obstacles in the path of those who see no task greater than the prevention of war. If we are to succeed, where other generations have failed, we must master the ability of unbiased thinking about the issues that divide mankind; we must reject nationalistic prejudice and rationalizations that perpetuate two antagonistic camps of nations, each self-righteously identifying the other as the villain. Honest self-criticism, unadulterated by national favoritism, is therefore a national virtue on which world peace itself may hinge. The individual's part in this is to assert himself intellectually, socially and politically. Unless he rejects the hypnotic influences of a totalitarian mass psychology, he renders himself incapable of acting for the preservation of peace.

The sole and ultimate purpose of all the activities of THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE will be to contribute to the preservation of peace everywhere. The activities of THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE will address themselves to social problems directly or ultimately weighing in the balance of war and peace.

THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE, as a foundation, has no specific political message and no loyalty other than peace and all that serves peace, specifically including independence of thought. You and I are the minorities of one if only we do not fear our thoughts. Our thoughts may collide, or they may coincide or complement each other, but even then let us each remain a minority of one.

True to this tenet, neither membership in nor activities on behalf of THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE will indicate an explicit or implicit endorsement of individual views expressed in any publications the foundation might sponsor.

THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE will sponsor the magazine *The Minority of One* and such publishing and public activities as will serve the preservation of peace. The editor of *The Minority of One*, M. S. Arnoni, will retain full editorial independence.

For these lofty goals we call on men and women everywhere to

join the ranks of THE FRIENDS OF THE MINORITY OF ONE and to support sincerely our efforts on behalf of peace.

*Prof. Daniel M. Berman
Bishop Clarence E. Duffy, D.D.
W. H. Ferry
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman*

*Dr. Stuart Kabnick
Ava Helen Pauling
Prof. Linus Pauling
Prof. Ernest B. Ziesler*

Membership Drive

On March 22, 1961, a group of subscribers to *The Minority of One* met in New York to discuss the establishment of a non-profit and tax-exempt foundation to sponsor the magazine. A similar meeting was held in Boston two days later.

The undersigned volunteered to act as a membership and finance committee for the foundation which is being incorporated in the State of New York. Because of the serious and growing threats to world peace, we urgently call upon all the readers of *The Minority of One* to make a great effort, and a great sacrifice if necessary, to keep *The Minority of One* alive. Without such efforts *The Minority of One*, which we consider an important voice for peace, may cease to exist.

There are the following five categories of membership in *The Friends of The Minority of One*:

<i>Life Friends</i>	contributing \$1,000 or more
<i>Sponsoring Friends</i>	" \$ 500
<i>Sustaining Friends</i>	" \$ 250
<i>Supporting Friends</i>	" \$ 100
<i>Contributing Friends</i>	" \$ 10 to \$50 per year

We respectfully and urgently ask you to become one of *The Friends of The Minority of One* in whichever of the above categories your financial position enables you to. Let us, at this time of universal peril, use our personal resources to avert a catastrophe that might rob us not only of our financial means and comforts but also of our lives.

Checks and money orders should be made payable to *The Friends of The Minority of One*. We hope that we shall shortly have the privilege to acknowledge your contribution to peace and freedom.

Respectfully yours,

*Costa Chitouras
Rt. Rev. Clarence E. Duffy, D.D.
Lydia R. Shrebnick*

*Martin Hird
Douglas MacKay*

THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.
P. O. Box 544
Passaic, N. J.

I wish to become a sponsor of THE MINORITY OF ONE and will contribute

\$..... monthly.

My first donation of \$..... is enclosed herewith.

ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION FOR

- 1 year—\$5.00 (In Canada \$5.25)
- 2 year—\$9.00 (In Canada \$9.50)

ENCLOSED IS MY CONTRIBUTION OF

\$..... TO YOUR PUBLICATION FUND.

Back issues available at 50¢ per copy.

S U B S C R I P T I O N F O R M

ALSO ENTER GIFT SUBSCRIPTIONS
AT THE RATE OF \$4.00 PER YEAR FOR:

1. NAME

St. & No.

City (Zone) (State)

2. NAME

St. & No.

City (Zone) (Satte)

I further suggest you mail free sample copies to the parties listed by me separately.

3. NAME

St. & No.

City (Zone) (Satte)

Acknowledge gift subscriptions in the name of

My name

St. & No.

City (Zone) (State)

Signature.....

Of What I Am Ashamed:

► OF AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON AND HIS SUPERIORS for rejecting a United Nations resolution setting a deadline for the evacuation of Belgian personnel from the Congo.

► OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT for its unrelenting hostile campaign against Mr. Rajeshwar Dayal, the United Nations special representative in the Congo, for his reluctance to execute Belgian-American schemes in the Congo.

► OF THE REPUBLICAN MEMBERS of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee for attempting to protect the price-fixing and bid-rigging criminals of the electrical industry from public exposure by voting in favor of closed-door interrogations of them.

► OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION for using scare tactics in fighting against the Administration's program of medical care for the aged, as illuminated by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff.

► OF SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG for suggesting legislation that would bar the recruitment of Mexicans to work on U.S. farms instead of seeking legislation to protect their elementary interests.

► OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT for putting the Cuban coast under a permanent "umbrella" of American jet fighters.

► OF BRIG. GENERAL ANDREW JACKSON BOYLE, commander of the U.S. Military Assistance in Laos, and his SUPERIORS for announcing full involvement of American officers on the side of the Laotian power usurpers.

► OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE for detaining and harassing a Cuban airliner forced to land at an American base in Bermuda.

► OF THE SEMI-OFFICIAL GANGS OF TOUGHS that have been sent into Philadelphia, Pa. and elsewhere to assault physically demonstrators against U.S. interventionism in Cuba.

► OF THE U.S. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT for ordering a blackout on news pertaining to missile tests.

► OF FORMER VICE-PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON for waging a demagogic campaign of stigmatizing the few and inadequate social measures of the Kennedy Administration as a "too left" program.

► OF FORMER PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER for lending his support to President Kennedy's course of open and almost-open aggression in foreign policy and specifically towards Cuba.

► OF THE SUPREME COURT MAJORITY DECISIONS upholding states' refusals to license the practice of law on the part of individuals refusing to cooperate with unconstitutional inquiries into their political convictions.

international community, including the Soviet Union and the other 41 powers who in effect voted in the U.N. Political Committee to censure America for her part in the Cuban invasion, that he will subdue the Castro regime even at the peril of precipitating a general world war. He sounds quite sincere in this recklessness.

What the next act in the Cuban tragedy will be only Mr. Kennedy and his military advisors know. But even they don't know its ultimate outcome. What is obvious is that Mr. Kennedy has set off a volcano in continuous eruption.

Yet, it is not the admission of our utterly Machiavellian strong-arm policies that is of historic importance. The danger stems from the actual policies, whether or not their motivation is acknowledged. In practical terms, this policy is a departure from "brinkmanship" in the sense that while brinkmanship consisted of occasional encampments on the brink of catastrophe, the Kennedy course gives permanence to that encampment. Brinkmanship has been converted into a full-time policy that has one objective and never loses sight of it: the Communists must be forced into continual retreat under all circumstances and in all situations. It was not a concession to West German Chancellor Adenauer that during his visit in Washington President Kennedy eagerly assured him that this country would not hesitate to use nuclear bombs; Mr. Kennedy arrived at this position independently and in perfect consistency with his global view.

With this approach we are hardly going to experience even a relatively relaxed period during the Kennedy Administration. Yesterday it was Cuba, tomorrow it will be Cuba once more. Laos too will be heated and re-heated to the boiling point. Then there will be Viet-Nam and Berlin. And as surely as Mr. Kennedy is determined to force the Soviets into a policy of appeasement, nuclear test explosions will be resumed by this country before long. In fact, it is difficult to predict each and every international crisis that will issue from Washington. The only certainty is that a policy of permanent brinkmanship will produce them at a faster pace than they can be solved.

Mr. Kennedy has departed on a course actively challenging the Soviets. Practically nothing they can do short of truly defeatist appeasement is going to avert those challenges. One cannot predict the result of each particular international crisis. But we can be certain that the Soviet Union will not voluntarily acquiesce in the defeatist position Mr. Kennedy assigns to it. An open, determined and unequivocal power politics on our part is going to invite their response in kind. Each of the crises, therefore, that are being blueprinted in the frequent Adenauer-Kennedy-Macmillan consultations may well end in either some local war or a global conflagration. Unfortunately, Mr. Kennedy does not seem to conceive of such an eventuality as intolerable.

April 22, 1961

The Kennedy Offensive (Continued from page 5)

presence of American experts. On the same page the TIMES carried a Washington dispatch from E. W. Kenworthy reporting on the conferences held between Cuban counter-revolutionary leaders and high officials of the State Department. In a display of unbelievable cynicism, the dispatch ended with the State Department's ridiculing response to the obviously justified, and everywhere else admittedly justified, accusations of Dr. Raul Roa, Cuban Foreign Minister, in the U.N. that the U.S. was supporting "a so-called liberation army of 4,000 to 5,000 counter-revolutionaries, mercenaries and adventurers preparing for the invasion of Cuba."

What followed, the actual invasion, left nothing to be guessed at. Nor is there any need for guessing what the next act in the Cuban tragedy will be. With the candor of a hold-up man Mr. Kennedy announced before the whole world that no matter what international legal instruments are breached or ignored; no matter how other American republics feel on the subject, no matter what the sentiments of the Cuban people who have just rebuked him by not joining the invasion as he had hoped they would do, Cuba is going to be subdued. Politically, nothing was left unsaid; only the military blueprint remains to be guessed at.

Mr. Kennedy has also made clear to the